COLLECTED WORKS OF ERASMUS

PARAPHRASE ON LUKE 11–24

COLLECTED WORKS OF ERASMUS

VOLUME 48

This page intentionally left blank

COLLECTED WORKS OF ERASMUS

NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP

General Editor Robert D. Sider

PARAPHRASE ON LUKE 11–24

translated and annotated by

Jane E. Phillips

University of Toronto Press

Toronto / Buffalo / London

www.utppublishing.com

The research and publication costs of the
Collected Works of Erasmus are supported by
University of Toronto Press.

© University of Toronto Press 2003

Toronto / Buffalo / London
Printed in Canada

ISBN 0-8020-3653-8

Printed on acid-free paper

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Erasmus, Desiderius, d. 1536
[Works]
Collected works of Erasmus

Translation of : Paraphrasis in Novum Testamentum Des. Erasmi Roterdami.
Includes bibliograpical references and index.
Contents: v. 48. Paraphrase on Luke / translated and annotated
by Jane E. Phillips.
ISBN 0-8020-3653-8 (v. 48)

1. Erasmus, Desiderius, d. 1536 – Collected works. I. Title.

PA8500 1974 199'.492 C74-006326-X rev

University of Toronto Press acknowledges the financial assistance to its publishing program of the Canada Council and the Ontario Arts Council.

University of Toronto Press acknowledges the financial support for its publishing activities of the Government of Canada through the Book Publishing Industry Development Program (BPIDP).

Collected Works of Erasmus

The aim of the Collected Works of Erasmus
is to make available an accurate, readable English text
of Erasmus' correspondence and his
other principal writings. The edition is planned
and directed by an Editorial Board, an Executive Committee,
and an Advisory Committee.

EDITORIAL BOARD

William Barker, University of King's College
Alexander Dalzell, University of Toronto
James M. Estes, University of Toronto
Charles Fantazzi, East Carolina University
James K. Farge, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
John N. Grant, University of Toronto
Paul F. Grendler, University of Toronto
Brad Inwood, University of Toronto
James K. McConica, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, *Chairman*
John H. Munro, University of Toronto
John O'Malley, Weston Jesuit School of Theology
Mechtilde O'Mara, University of Toronto
Jane E. Phillips, University of Kentucky
Erika Rummel, Wilfrid Laurier University
R.J. Schoeck, Lawrence, Kansas
Robert D. Sider, Dickinson College
James D. Tracy, University of Minnesota

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Alexander Dalzell, University of Toronto
James M. Estes, University of Toronto
Charles Fantazzi, East Carolina University
Paul F. Grendler, University of Toronto
Bill Harnum, University of Toronto Press
James K. McConica, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
George Meadows, University of Toronto Press

John O'Malley, Weston Jesuit School of Theology
Mechtilde O'Mara, University of Toronto
Jane E. Phillips, University of Kentucky
Erika Rummel, Wilfrid Laurier University
R.J. Schoeck, Lawrence, Kansas
R.M. Schoeffel, University of Toronto Press, *Chairman*
Robert D. Sider, Dickinson College
James D. Tracy, University of Minnesota

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Maria Cytowska, University of Warsaw
Anthony Grafton, Princeton University
H.J. de Jonge, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden
Robert M. Kingdon, University of Wisconsin
Maurice Lebel, Université Laval
Jean-Claude Margolin, Centre d'études supérieures de la Renaissance de Tours
Bruce M. Metzger, Princeton Theological Seminary
Clarence H. Miller, Saint Louis University
John Rowlands, The British Museum
J.S.G. Simmons, Oxford University
John Tedeschi, University of Wisconsin
J. Trapman, Conseil International ASD
J.B. Trapp, Warburg Institute
Timothy J. Wengert, The Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia

NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE

J.J. Bateman, University of Illinois
H.J. de Jonge, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden
James K. McConica, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
Bruce M. Metzger, Princeton Theological Seminary
Jaroslav Pelikan, Yale University
Robert D. Sider, Dickinson College, *Chairman*

Contents

Translator's Note
by Jane E. Phillips
ix

Paraphrase on Luke / Paraphrasis in Lucam
translated and annotated by Jane E. Phillips
1

The Sequence and Dates of the Publication
of the Paraphrases
282

Works Frequently Cited
283

Short-Title Forms for Erasmus' Works
286

Index of Scriptural Passages Cited
291

Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited
303

General Index
309

This page intentionally left blank

Translator's Note

This volume contains the second half of the translation of Erasmus' *Paraphrase on the Gospel of Luke*, with annotation for the modern reader. The original *Paraphrasis* was published as an undivided whole, but the CWE editors recognized from the outset that translation and annotation of the whole would not be possible within a single volume. The collaborators charged with the two volumes that were designated for this *Paraphrase*, CWE 47 and 48, decided that a fair division could be made at nearly the midpoint of the text, that is, between chapters 10 and 11; but the reader should understand that this division represents nothing in Erasmus' own work, nor does it claim to stand for a modern analysis of his rhetorical or thematic purpose. The present translation begins, therefore, *in medias res*.

The competing pressures of modern academic life have resulted in the appearance of the second half of the *Paraphrase on Luke* some years before the first half can be expected. The Introduction and the Translator's Note to CWE 47 will introduce the whole *Paraphrase* and its annotation to an English-speaking readership more fully, and, where what is said here may go astray, shed more light. The reader is referred to that as yet unwritten material.

In August 1523, barely eight months after the publication of the *Paraphrase on John*, the Froben press in Basel published the first edition of the *Paraphrase on Luke*. Three more editions, lightly corrected, appeared during Erasmus' lifetime as part of Froben's re-editions of the complete *Paraphrases* in 1524, 1534, and 1535.[1] Following the practice of CWE, the text translated here is that of 1535, the last one to which Erasmus himself is likely to have

* * * * *

1 For the whole history of the publication of the *Paraphrases*, see the essay by R.A.B. Mynors, 'The Publication of the Latin *Paraphrases*' CWE 42 xx–xxix.

made corrections and additions. The annotations will show where this text or the earlier editions diverge significantly from that reprinted in the seventh volume of the *Opera Omnia* published by Jean Leclerc (Johannes Clericus) in Leiden in 1703–6.

Translation is an exercise in accommodation to the source text and to the readers. This translation endeavours to reproduce in English something of the effect of Erasmus' paraphrasing Latin – now swift and colloquial; now profoundly biblical in quotation, near-quotation, or improvisation; now echoing the pagan classics, which he and at least a portion of his readership read for the quality of their Latin and their insight into human nature. Sometimes Erasmus' longer sentences, more complex than modern English readers are accustomed to, have been broken up. But breaking up a long sentence while simultaneously retaining the emphasis of each of its parts can make a long Latin sentence into a tedious English paragraph. Some long sentences have been retained, though I attempt to render them in a way that makes them absorbable, especially if they are read aloud and with attention to the punctuation. Vocabulary too, especially the vocabulary of terms important in theology and religious practice, cannot always be transferred simply, since each language and even each religious group among users of the same language has its own sense of what sounds 'right.' In this volume I have tended to translate *servus* as 'slave' rather than 'servant,' since it more clearly names the status of *servi* in Luke's time, whose voice Erasmus is claiming to reproduce; *sermo* is usually 'word' rather than 'conversation,' because Erasmus took *sermo* to be a better translation of λόγος than *verbum* 'word' in the opening of the Gospel of John, and English speakers are most familiar with 'Word' as the theological concept so designated. *Evangelicus* is translated as the adjective 'gospel' rather than 'evangelical.' *Pius* is usually 'godly' and *impius* 'godless,' 'ungodly,' or 'unholy'; only rarely are they 'pious' and 'impious.' For discussion of the meanings of *sermo* 'word,' *fides* and *fiducia* 'faith,' *resipiscere* 'repent,' *crassus* 'dull-witted,' 'thickheaded,' *dominus* 'lord,' and other terms with important religious resonances, see the Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited, and for other choices or further discussions, see the translators' notes and indexes of Greek and Latin words in other volumes of the *Paraphrases*.

Erasmus himself saw the advisability of accommodating his paraphrase on Holy Scripture both to the expectations of his readers and to his own judgment, informed by study of the Greek text and by a thorough knowledge of good Latin usage, about what the correct Greek sense of a given passage was and how it should be expressed in Latin. The

nature of amplifying paraphrase lends itself to accommodation in both directions.[2] In many places where his scholarly *Annotations* on the New Testament defended alterations and additions to, and subtractions from, the Vulgate familiar to his readers, the *Paraphrases* still employed the familiar words, even when they also presented the meaning of Erasmus' reformed text. Such places are signalled in the notes.

In general the annotation in this volume attempts to depict for the reader the intellectual context of the *Paraphrase*, focused roughly in four areas. The first shows how Erasmus drew on his familiarity with the Greek and Roman classics and with Scripture in order to add character to this Gospel's setting in historical time and to its narrator,[3] and in order to hone the Latin in which he portrayed it. As he says at the close of Ep 1381, the prefatory letter to Henry VIII, the purpose of paraphrasing was to season the food of the gospel so that it could be read with greater ease and profit.

The second area of annotation is concerned with how Erasmus situated himself in the mainstream of more than a thousand years of exegesis in interpreting Jesus' life and words. The intent is to illustrate how Erasmus' interpretations in general align themselves with the tradition of exegesis that, chiefly from his remarks in letters, in works like the *Ratio verae theologiae*, and especially in the *Annotations*, we know he read and valued.[4] Among Christian classics of exegesis Ambrose and Bede on the Latin side, and Cyril of Alexandria and Theophylact on the Greek, had written continuous commentaries on Luke; there were also Jerome's continuous commentary and John Chrysostom's sermon series on Matthew to help out where the two Gospels were telling versions of the same story. In addition there

* * * * *

2 For discussion of Erasmus' purposes and methods in writing the *Paraphrases*, see 'The *Paraphrases* of Erasmus: Origin and Character' CWE 42 xi–xix and the translators' notes in other CWE translations of the Paraphrases – to date, 44 (Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Peter, Jude, James, John, Hebrews), 46 (John), 49 (Mark), and 50 (Acts).

3 For one analysis of Erasmus' characterization of Luke the narrator throughout this paraphrase, see Jane E. Phillips '"Sub Evangelistae Persona": The Speaking Voice in Erasmus' *Paraphrase on Luke*' in *Holy Scripture Speaks: The Production and Reception of Erasmus' Paraphrases on the New Testament* ed Hilmar Pabel and Mark Vessey (Toronto 2002).

4 Cf Erika Rummel *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament: From Philologist to Theologian* Erasmus Studies 8 (Toronto 1986) 52–74 for the subject in general. What is said there of the *Annotations* logically applies to the *Paraphrases* as well.

were other sources that, while not restricted to examination of this Gospel, contained important material devoted to parts of it: Augustine's *De consensu evangelistarum* and *Quaestiones evangeliorum*, and his *Sermones de scripturis*, Gregory the Great's XL *Homiliae*, and other works. But the sermons on Luke by Origen, a writer for whom Erasmus had the highest respect, were not well preserved and in any case did not pay much attention to the second half of the Gospel. The commentary on Luke by Cyril of Alexandria, another writer Erasmus esteemed highly, was certainly known to him not in its entirety but from excerpts in the *Catena aurea* of Thomas Aquinas, and perhaps also from excerpts in Greek catenae like those from which its text in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* was later reconstructed.[5]

Medieval treatment of biblical exegesis, intended mostly for the schooling of clerics and members of religious communities, relied heavily on excerpts from earlier work. Excerpting and arranging others' ideas to serve newly emergent purposes or circumstances can be itself an expression of the excerptor's ideas, but it can also be – perhaps more often is – a deformation of its originals. Bede, late in the Latin patristic tradition, already contains a high proportion of material quoted verbatim or summarized from earlier exegetes. Theophylact, well into medieval times, is largely a digest of Chrysostom and other Greek Fathers. Thomas Aquinas' *Catena aurea* is a broad-ranging compilation of earlier comment from a variety of exegetical sources on the four Gospels, arranged to follow the narrative in each one. Similar in conception and arrangement though much briefer and more narrowly focused are the medieval *Gloss*, in interlinear and marginal forms,

* * * * *

5 The 'commentary' (*explanatio* in PG 72) in fact was a series of sermons. In Byzantine times the full Greek texts were neglected in favour of excerpts in catenae ('chains' or anthologies of exegetical material) on the Gospel of Luke, from which Angelo Cardinal Mai made a reconstruction in the mid-nineteenth century. It seems most likely that only the Greek catenae or selections from them in the *Catena aurea* would have been available to anyone in Western Europe in Erasmus' day. Thus Cyril will be cited in the notes according to Mai's text in PG 72, with references also to the versions in the *Catena aurea* where these parallel or supplement that text. The shortcomings of Mai's text in the light of later discoveries are well known but probably do not affect comparison of Cyril's exegesis with Erasmus' work. See Johannes Quasten *Patrology* III: *The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature from the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon* (Utrecht/Antwerp 1960) 123–4, Mai's preface in PG 68 97–8, and the discussion of the Byzantine catenae Mai used by Adolf Rücker *Die Lukas-Homilien des hl. Cyrill von Alexandrien: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Exegese* (Breslau 1911) 14–32.

and the running commentaries of Nicholas of Lyra and Hugh of St Cher.[6] Erasmus knew all of these and others as well, as the *Annotations* show. In his mature thinking the medieval derivatives paled in comparison with the work of the original authors, yet they would have been his first introduction to their sources.

Citing patristic and medieval commentaries in these notes, it should be remembered, is intended to demonstrate where Erasmus parallels their thought and to suggest that these materials as a whole are likely to be his sources. But the notes do not claim to describe definitively what his exact sources in each instance were or how he employed each one in his theological and pastoral undertaking. Much work remains to be done in this area of Erasmus studies.

Third, the notes point to parallels of thought and topic in other of Erasmus' own writings, especially those that are earlier than or clustered around the time when this *Paraphrase* was composed. His *Annotations* on the New Testament are most important here. Since the text of the *Paraphrase* was nearly unaltered throughout its publishing history in Erasmus' lifetime, while the *Annotations* grew considerably over their five editions (1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, and 1535, revised and reprinted simultaneously with new editions of Erasmus' revision of the Vulgate New Testament with Greek text) the 1522 *Annotations*, the ones that immediately precede the appearance of this *Paraphrase*, are the touchstone of these notes.

Fourth, the notes address one area that extends beyond 1523 and the initial publication of the *Paraphrase*. Erasmus' biblical scholarship, and in particular, since they addressed a general reading public, the *Paraphrases*, were subjected to intense criticism by conservative theologians during his lifetime. The *Paraphrase on Luke* came in for a good part of the objections expressed in print by the Paris faculty of theology. They were answered, also in print, by Erasmus over the ten years following the appearance of the *Paraphrase*.[7] His responses, together with the criticisms as he summarized them, are reported in the notes.

* * * * *

6 For details on these see eg the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* ed F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone (Oxford 1997) and, for the Latin side, Beryl Smalley *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford 1983). In the notes in this volume, 'the *Gloss*' without further specification means the marginal *Gloss*.

7 See the history of the controversies, in particular about the *Paraphrases*, by Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and His Catholic Critics* II: *1523–36* (Nieuwkoop 1989).

References in the notes to the text of the Gospel of Luke, in every instance except where confusion could occur, appear only as chapter and verse, without 'Luke' preceding. Following CWE practice, the standard text of the Bible for book titles, chapter and verse numbering, and for unproblematical text is the Revised Standard Version (RSV). Where appropriate the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), the King James (or Authorized) Version (AV), and especially in chapter 24 the Douay-Rheims translation (DV) have been consulted. Italicized dates, such as *1523*, are shorthand references to the edition of the Erasmian work under discussion.

For the reader of this volume the best guide to the *Paraphrase* is the Gospel of Luke itself, preferably in an edition well cross-referenced to the rest of the Bible. The volume's General Index covers in the first instance the material of the annotation as just described. Since the notes document in considerable detail parallels to Erasmus' explications from the Lucan commentaries of Cyril, Ambrose, Bede, Theophylact, the *Gloss*, the *Catena aurea*, Nicholas of Lyra, and Hugh of St Cher, individual references to their comments on the verse or verses being paraphrased are omitted from the Index, as are references to corresponding passages in Erasmus' *Annotations on Luke*. Where Erasmus has amplified his source text, however, in a way not readily deducible from a literal reading of the relevant Gospel passage, the Index does refer directly to the *Paraphrase*, most notably in the case of the long elaboration on 19:40 (149–52), and the much longer excursus on 24:27 (235–70; cf n31).

The text of the *Paraphrase* lifetime editions and of the 1522 *Annotations* was taken from photocopies of Froben editions provided by CWE. For the *Paraphrase*, comparisons with variants in the Leiden edition of 1703–6 (LB) are made regularly in the notes, since that is the edition of the Latin text most likely to be available (at this date) to interested readers. As for the *Annotations*, the critical edition of the *Annotations* on Matthew, Mark, and Luke, published as volume VI-5 of the Amsterdam edition (ASD), became available only when this volume was teetering on the edge of completion. It contains extensive documentation of sources and alterations in the *Annotations* and comparisons with the textual history of Erasmus' own re-editing of the Vulgate New Testament, and it is warmly recommended to readers interested in pursuing such questions.[8]

* * * * *

8 A complete list of abbreviations and their expansions appears in the Works Frequently Cited at the end of this volume.

It remains to thank all those who have aided me during the preparation of CWE 48. The work began with support from a Summer Fellowship from the United States' National Endowment for the Humanities. Over the years invaluable resources have been provided by the University of Kentucky Libraries, the Special Collections Department of the Library of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Divinity Library of Duke University, the Library of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies in Toronto, and the Library of Lexington Theological Seminary, and through academic cooperation in the form of interlibrary loans. Many colleagues have unstintingly answered questions or discussed problems that emerged from the text; one colleague, James C. Albisetti, graciously adopted the role of 'educated general reader' and read nearly all the translation in draft form; the readers for the Press contributed significantly to the final form of translation and annotation. Finally, this volume owes much to the capability and the humanity of its copyeditor, Mary Baldwin, and its typesetters, Philippa Matheson and Lynn Burdon.

JEP

This page intentionally left blank

PARAPHRASE ON LUKE 11–24

Paraphrasis in Lucam 11–24

PARAPHRASE ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE

Chapter 11

In this figure[1] Jesus had taught that those who devote themselves entirely to heavenly teaching are engaged in a great undertaking, for no one can handle this teaching sincerely unless he shakes himself free of all the lusts and cares of this world. Now it remained for him also to prescribe the method of praying. For prayer is as it were the purest sacrifice of gospel religion; Jesus often withdrew for prayer and accustomed his disciples to do the same. And prayer is that secret meeting place where the human mind, having shaken off all haunting anxieties about earthly things and being carried up, in a way, to heaven, converses with God.[2] Now the Pharisees

* * * * *

1 The reference is to the story of Mary and Martha at the end of Luke 10; see CWE 47. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 472A–B also uses a reference to the preceding story to introduce his commentary on chapter 11. The 'figure' (*imago*) may refer to the whole incident, or more specifically to the paraphrast's closing comment in chapter 10: 'As in the body the eye, sitting at leisure, does more than the hand, busily doing its duty in a variety of services, so those who devote themselves entirely to the things that concern eternal salvation, though they seem to be on holiday from material duties, are still doing more because they are doing what is chiefly necessary.' For hand and eye as examples of various functions of the Christian corporate body, cf 1 Cor 12:21.

2 On prayer as a sacrifice cf eg Pss 51:16–17 and 141:2, and the paraphrase on John 4:21–4 CWE 46 58. For Jesus' practice of withdrawing for prayer, for his own sake and to teach his disciples to do so, cf eg Matt 6:6 and 18 (including references to the secrecy of the meeting between God and supplicant), Luke 5:16, 6:12, and 9:28 (and the paraphrases on these passages), and the paraphrase on John 6:3 CWE 46 75. Erasmus' views on prayer are thoroughly investigated by Hilmar Pabel *Conversing with God: Prayer in Erasmus' Pastoral Writings* (Toronto 1997); for discussion of most of these themes, see especially 34–42.

used to pray, both often and at length, but gloomy-faced and in public. The disciples of John prayed too, and the Samaritans prayed on their mountain. Even the religion of the gentiles had its own prayers.[3] But since not everyone had the same mode of praying, nor were the same things being asked for, the apostles wanted to have Jesus prescribe the form they should follow. So Jesus, as was his custom, had withdrawn with his disciples to pray; and when his prayer was finished some one of the disciples said to him, 'Since we are your disciples, Lord, it is right for us to do all things as you prescribe. Teach us, then, a form of prayer too, just as John taught his disciples while he was alive.'

Now when Jesus had explicitly taught his followers that the prayer of Christians ought not to be wordy or arranged for show or on just any topic,[4] he laid down a form of the following kind. Though the form is shared by everyone, it is more particularly fitting for men of the gospel, for their whole effort (since they are as it were removed from this world)[5] is to the end that the glory of God be made to shine among the good; and that day by day his kingdom may flourish more and more, once the kingdom of Satan has been overthrown; and that, just as there is no rebellion against the will of God in heaven, from which Lucifer with his fellow conspirators was thrown headlong, so among the children of God, who will succeed to the place of the banished angels,[6] everything may come to pass in accordance with the will of the heavenly Father: that is, that he may feed his own on the bread of heavenly teaching and grace, which quickens and fattens souls for eternal life; and that he like a kindly father may mercifully forgive

* * * * *

3 Cf eg 18:10–12, Matt 6:5 (Pharisees, hypocrites), 11:1 just below (disciples of John), John 4:20 (Samaritans), Matt 6:7 (gentiles).

4 Erasmus appears to allude to the preface to the Lord's Prayer at Matt 6:5–8.

5 The comment that the Lord's Prayer has special application to 'men of the gospel' (*viris evangelicis*), like other indications throughout the *Paraphrases* (cf the paraphrases on John 13:8 and John 17 CWE 46 161 and 192–8), implies that clergy, probably especially preaching and parochial clergy, were intended as one primary readership for the *Paraphrases*. Such comments also mark for a lay readership criteria by which it may evaluate its clergy; cf Jane E. Phillips 'The Gospel, the Clergy, and the Laity in Erasmus' *Paraphrase on the Gospel of John*' ERSY 10 (1990) 85–100. There is no such explicit comment in other treatments of the Lord's Prayer by Erasmus, though something similar could certainly be deduced from his representation of the Sermon on the Mount as addressed to the disciples, not the attendant crowds; cf the paraphrase on Matt 5:1.

6 On Lucifer see Isa 14:12, Luke 10:18, 2 Pet 2:4, Jude 6, Rev 12:9. Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 856B notes on Luke 11:4 that the angels in heaven do all that they do according to God's will.

his children for whatever has been done by human weakness against his will, just as they themselves pardon each other if one has committed any wrong against another; and since while they live in this mortal body they are able not only to advance towards the better but also to slip towards the worse, especially since the tyrant Satan is in every way inciting them to this latter course, that they may be preserved by the Father's aid against Satan's machinations; and that they either may not fall into temptation, or if they do, may come away the victors, under the protection of him who is mightier.[7]

Now the form of the prayer is this:[8] Our heavenly Father, we who have been set upon the earth, whom your goodness has honoured with the name of children, pray you that through our teaching and life your

* * * * *

7 As often, Erasmus has given a summary of what is to follow as an introduction to the paraphrase on significant material. In both summary and paraphrase proper, he adds allusion to the petitions found in Matt 6:9–13 but not in Luke: 'thy will be done,' explained here as the feeding on daily bread and the forgiveness of sins, and 'deliver us from evil.' As Pabel *Conversing with God* (n2 above) points out in 'Interpreting the Lord's Prayer' 110–15, Erasmus had several occasions in his career to expound his view of the significance of this prayer: the revised New Testament text and accompanying *Annotations* on Matthew and Luke in all their editions; likewise the *Paraphrases* on the same two Gospels; and a separate paraphrase in the form of a seven-day prayer cycle based on the seven petitions of the prayer (in the more familiar version from Matthew 6), the *Precatio dominica,* which was published in October 1523, only weeks after the publication of the *Paraphrase on Luke.* Other relevant works are his general treatise on prayer, the *Modus orandi Deum* (1524/5); the end of his catechism on the Apostles' Creed, *Explanatio symboli* (1533); and the first prayer, also a paraphrase on the Lord's Prayer, in his collection of new prayers, *Precationes aliquot novae* (1535). Pabel explores Erasmus' theological interpretations and their antecedents for each of the seven petitions as well as for the overall relationship between God and his worshippers, finding a high degree of consistency among all Erasmus' writings that touch on the prayer. For further details, see Pabel 115–54 and his subsequent article, 'Erasmus' Esteem for Cyprian: Parallels in Their Expositions of the Lord's Prayer' ERSY 17 (1997) 55–69.

8 Patristic and medieval commentators point out that where Matthew has seven petitions in the prayer, three for things eternal and four for things temporal, Luke has five. Augustine *Enchiridion* 116 CCL 46 111 explains that the difference of number in Luke is a means of understanding Matthew's seven, for by omitting the third ('thy will be done') Luke indicates that it recapitulates the content of the first two; the same is true of the omission of the seventh, 'but deliver us from evil,' a request that merely fills out, rather than adds to, 'lead us not into temptation.' Augustine is followed closely by Bede *In Lucam expos*

power, your wisdom, and your goodness'[9] may become more and more known among humankind, and that they understand that all glory is owed to your name, for from there comes whatever is illustrious in heaven or on earth whereby we ourselves, however humble, can boast in you.[10] Until now Satan has ruled in all the world through sin, to which humankind, enticed by wicked desires, has been enslaved; bring it about that, their sins removed and your spirit poured out upon them, all may obey your will.[11] And as you daily bestow on us the heavenly nourishment of your grace, may we ever advance towards the better until we arrive at the perfection of gospel godliness.[12] Then, seeing that we are human, if through error or

* * * * *

PL 92 472B–473A, the marginal *Gloss,* and Nicholas of Lyra (both on 11:2–4). Erasmus' paraphrase here (but not the preceding summary) instead takes 'thy will be done,' Matthew's third petition, as subsuming 'thy kingdom come,' the second petition in Matthew and Luke. He also retains the address 'our heavenly Father,' as in Matthew, and closes with a paraphrase on Matthew's 'deliver us from evil.' His own annotation *sed libera nos a malo* (on 11:4) says that the shorter version in Luke is evidence that the evangelists are not superstitious about a form of words.

9 A regular trifold description of the divine attributes in Erasmus' thought; cf eg *Adagia* III iii 1 CWE 34 270, the *Paraphrase on Psalm 3* CWE 63 164–5, and the paraphrase on Acts 17:25 CWE 50 109 with n36.

10 Both Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 685D and Hugh of St Cher (on 11:2) 197V emphasize the adoptive father-son relationship between God and the petitioner. A similar explanation of the hallowing of God's name, not that it could become holier than it already is but that knowledge of it should be increased throughout the world by the actions of those who pray this prayer, is found in Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 689A–B (also cited in the *Catena aurea* on 11:2–3), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 856A, and Hugh of St Cher (on 11:2) 197R–198R, citing Chrysostom.

11 Though commentators agree that 'thy will be done' recapitulates the previous two petitions, Erasmus has made the second (which is in both Matthew and Luke) rhetorically subordinate to the third (which is in Matthew but not in Luke). See n8 above.

12 Here and also in the paraphrase and annotation on Matt 6:11 Erasmus takes 'our daily bread' as spiritual nourishment and thus related to his other favourite equation between word (*sermo*) and Eucharistic bread; see the paraphrase on John 6 (and nn50 and 69 to that chapter in CWE 46) and Pabel *Conversing with God* (n2 above) 138–42. In completely excluding any reference to material needs he is implicitly rejecting part of the interpretation offered by Augustine *Enchiridion* 115 CCL 46 111 (echoed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 472C–473A), who says, 'the bread is called "daily" because the amount that must be given to soul and flesh is necessary, whether it is understood spiritually or physically or both ways.' Augustine repeats the description of daily

weakness we have done any wrong against you, Father, do not cease to be well disposed to your own, but in your mercy forgive us, since we forgive each other if by the same weakness brother commits wrong against brother, that there may be peace between us and that we may have peace with you.[13] But seeing that we know the wickedness and might of that wicked tyrant from whom your fatherly goodness has redeemed us, do not allow us to be overcome by him again; yet if, as a test of our long-suffering, you permit us to be afflicted either by him or by his minions, let us overcome ungodly men with your help, and let the assaults of the devil be turned to our good.'[14]

* * * * *

bread as both material necessities and (more important) spiritual nourishment in the Eucharist and other forms of teaching and worship in *Sermones de scripturis* 56, 57, and 58 (on Matt 6:7–13) PL 38 381, 389, 394–5. Similar views are in Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 691D–693C (also cited in the *Catena aurea* on 11:2–3), the *Gloss* (on 11:2–4), and Hugh of St Cher (on 11:3) 198r.

Erasmus' annotation *panem nostrum cotidianum* (on Matt 6:11) reviews several possibilities for the meaning of the Greek ἐπιούσιον (translated 'daily' most often in English) and expresses his own cautious preference for 'tomorrow's.' The paraphrase here stays with the familiar meaning. For a modern discussion of the ἐπιούσιον problem, see Fitzmyer AB Luke on this passage.

13 In the preceding summary and in the paraphrase Erasmus avoids an issue that had aroused protest over his revised Latin text of the New Testament and the accompanying annotation. There he had changed the traditional Vulgate *dimitte* 'forgive' in Matthew for *remitte*, which he felt better reflected the force of the Greek. Traditionalists were offended, as may be seen from his additions to later versions of the annotation *et dimitte* (on Matt 6:12). Here he uses other Latin words altogether, as a paraphrast might well be expected to do: *condonare* three times and *ignoscere* once. In Latin both words more specifically denote 'pardon,' 'forgive' than either *dimittere* or *remittere* does.

14 In the light of the commentators' agreement that Luke's version of the prayer (of which the last petition is 'And lead us not into temptation') contains the entire content of Matthew's version (which continues with 'but deliver us from evil' or 'the evil one'; cf nn8 and 11 above), Erasmus chooses to paraphrase primarily the final petition in Matthew. In this way his paraphrases follow Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 856B–C and stress the action of Satan ('the evil one') as the source of two kinds of trials: succumbing willfully to temptations and actual evil inflicted on us by others. The choice allows him also to accommodate Vulgate texts of Luke that did include 'but deliver us from evil.' His annotation *sed libera nos a malo* (on 11:4) says that the clause was not present in some of the oldest Latin manuscripts at his disposal and that he thinks it was added here to prevent apparent disagreement with the other version.

Furthermore, in order to stir up his followers to urgency in prayer and to increase confidence in their prayers' being granted, he added a comparison of the following kind:[15] 'Draw the conclusion from your own selves,' he said, 'about how ready God is to hear prayers, being naturally well disposed towards his children. If one of you should be without the necessities of life and should have a friend, he will be so bold as to approach his friend even in the middle of the night, knock on his door, and say, "Friend, give me three loaves of bread on loan, because a friend of mine fresh from a journey has unexpectedly dropped in on me as my guest this evening, and I have nothing at home to offer him to eat."[16] And perhaps that friend will not instantly grant what you seek, but being unwilling to open the door, will reply from inside, "Don't bother me with your late-night demands; my door is already shut and my servants[17] and I are in bed; I can't get up and give you what you want." Yet if he who needs the loaves does not promptly leave at this excuse but continues knocking[18] at his friend's door, I assure you, even if regard for friendship does not move the other, he will still be overcome by the shamelessness of the suppliant; he will get up and

* * * * *

15 Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1810B, Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 105 PL 38 618, and Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 696D–697A (also cited in the *Catena aurea* on 11:5) all identify the twin purposes of this comparison as encouragement to urgency in prayer and assurance of God's favourable answer.

16 Erasmus uses *da mihi commodato* for the Vulgate *commoda* 'lend.' He notes in the annotation *commoda* (on 11:5) that Latin has two words for lending, *commodare* for an object that will be returned and *mutuare* for an object that will be used up by the borrower, who will have to return not the object itself but its equivalent; here the second ought to have been used by the Vulgate translator. In the paraphrase, however, he does not follow through on this observation, perhaps in order to accommodate the familiar Vulgate text.
'Has unexpectedly dropped in on me as my guest this evening' (*subito oppressit me vespertinus hospes*) is an adaptation of Horace *Satires* 2.4.17 *si vespertinus subito te oppresserit hospes* 'if an evening guest has unexpectedly dropped in on you,' words ascribed to a culinary expert advising his students on the finer points of his specialty.

17 While Erasmus' and the Vulgate's *pueri*, translating the Greek τὰ παιδία, could mean either 'children' or 'slaves,' Erasmus probably accepted the traditional understanding of the term here, following Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 105 PL 38 618, who substitutes *servi* 'slaves,' 'servants' for *pueri*.

18 In the annotation *si perseveraverit pulsans* (on 11:8) Erasmus points out that most Greek manuscripts and some Latin ones he has seen omit 'if he continues knocking' from verse 8; the paraphrase, however, accommodates the familiar Vulgate text.

give him not just the three loaves but as much as he needs. If one person's shamelessness in asking prevails so much with another person, how much more will it prevail with God, who takes delight in this sort of shamelessness and is not offended by it?[19] And whenever God puts off giving what is asked for, the reason is not stinginess or intractability; in this way he is igniting our desire so that he may give more lavishly what we are seeking and we may hold more dear what has been gotten by shameless prayers.[20] So what a needy friend would do with his human friend let each one of you much more dare to do before God your gracious Father, to whom such importuning is welcome and who cannot exhaust himself in giving.

'So ask him in prayer for what you need, and it will be given to you. Seek what you do not know, and by the inspiration of the Father's Spirit you will find what could not have been learned by human intelligence.[21] Knock, by adding to your prayers works of mercy towards your neighbours, and it will be opened to you.[22] This is the shamelessness by which God is as it

* * * * *

19 'Shamelessness' (*improbitas*), a prominent idea in the paraphrase here, is borrowed from the Vulgate text of 11:8. In the annotation *propter improbitatem* (on 11:8) Erasmus compliments the Vulgate translator on an elegant choice for the Greek ἀναίδεια. (In *1527* he adds that it can mean pressing on and not stopping; he then gives the famous quotation from Virgil *Georgics* 1.145–6: *Labor omnia vincit / improbus* 'Shameless [or 'relentless'] work conquers all.')
In this sentence the paraphrast adds what is merely implicit in the Gospel text: If this is the typical interaction between humans, how much more will it characterize the interaction between God and humans? Erasmus stresses the effectiveness of unabashed pleading by the supplicant. Augustine, on the other hand, *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.21, followed verbatim by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 473D and the *Gloss* (on 11:9), focuses on the difference between the human giver, 'who gives compelled not by friendship but by annoyance, and the divine one, who gives what is asked for very bountifully without being annoyed.'

20 For God's purpose in delaying the satisfaction of a supplicant's request, cf Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 697A: 'For what is gotten without effort and readily obtained is usually despised,' and Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 105 PL 38 619: 'And he postpones what he wishes to give so that you may desire it more because it has been postponed, lest it be cheapened by being given quickly.' Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:5–8) says that God sometimes postpones the gift he intends to give so that we get what we need after persistence in prayer.

21 For the thought that the Holy Spirit will teach believers what they could not have learned by unaided human intelligence, see John 14:26 and 16:13, Acts 2:2–12, and Erasmus' paraphrases on these passages CWE 46 170–1 and 187, CWE 50 16–17.

22 The equivalency of knocking and performing works of mercy for one's neighbour appears also in Hugh of St Cher (on 11:9) 200v: 'Knock, by doing works

were overcome and taken by storm. With a human being, sometimes prayers are poured out in vain, because the person is either unable or unwilling to provide what is asked. But with God whoever asks, receives; whoever seeks, finds; whoever knocks, it is opened to him.

'Furthermore, your Father knows what things are conducive to eternal salvation, and when asked he gladly gives them.[23] If he were asked by mistake for something harmful, he would consider it beneficial to deny what it was wrong to ask for, but in place of what was desired he would give what is wholesome.[24] The devotion of earthly parents to their children makes them unable to refuse their offspring if they want something that concerns their physical well-being. Draw the conclusion from your own selves. For who is there among you who, if he were to ask his own father for bread, would suppose that his father was going to give his son a stone instead of bread?[25] Or if he were to ask for a fish, would suppose that he was going to offer him a serpent instead of a fish? Or if he were to ask for an egg, would suppose that his father was going to give him a scorpion in an eggshell instead of an egg?[26] But if, among human beings in themselves

* * * * *

of mercy.' Christian treatment of one's neighbour is a theme that Erasmus emphasizes in the paraphrase on chapters 12–16 in this Gospel.

23 Cf Matt 6:8. God's willingness to give is brought out here also by Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 105 PL 38 619.

24 Verses 9–13 imply the question of what happens when harmful things are asked for. For Erasmus' reply here, cf James 4:3, a passage cited here, according to the *Catena aurea* on 11:9–13, by Origen. Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 857C–D says that such requests are not really requests because God does not grant harmful things, an explanation similar to one in Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:5–8), that a defect in what we ask for prevents fulfilment of our request.

25 Erasmus' Vulgate text of verse 11 read a nominative-case *quis ex vobis . . . filius petierit* 'which of you (being) a son will ask' and then switched to the father as the subject of 'will give.' As he remarks in the annotation *quis ex vobis patrem* (on 11:11), the Greek has an accusative case τίνα . . . τὸν πατέρα 'which of you (being) a father will his son ask?' Neither the Greek nor the Latin version produces smooth grammar, though the sense is clear enough, and Erasmus suspects an underlying Hebrew idiom. Rhetorically the question is whether Jesus asks his audience to picture themselves as the father or the son in the scene. In the annotation Erasmus' solution is to cast the audience as the giving father, like the Greek ('which of you, being a father, if his son asks for bread,' etc). Here, more like the Vulgate, he focuses on a son's expectation of his father's response.

26 In the same annotation cited in the last note Erasmus points out that there is an old joke in Plautus about a stone being held out to one who expects to get bread: 'In one hand he has a stone; he makes a show of the bread in the

evil, natural devotion can do so much that they are generous with their children seeking necessities, how much more will your Father, who is the Father of spirits, who is by nature good, impart to you from heaven his good Spirit, which will bestow all good things if you ask for them from him?[27] Satan also has his spirit, with which he inspires his followers, a tempter to everything evil; and the world has its own spirit, which lures to love of transitory things. With this spirit the Spirit of the heavenly Father has nothing in common. The one must depart so that the other can make its dwelling in your breast.'

And with that something happened that put before their eyes what the evil spirit was doing in the hearts of the Jews, who were struggling against the Holy Spirit. They led to Jesus a man in bondage to an evil demon, and not a simple demon but one that was both mute and blind at the same time, so that the man could neither look at nor speak to Jesus.[28] But Jesus, spontaneously taking pity on the unfortunate man, ordered the demon to

* * * * *

other hand' (*Aululariа* 195). Erasmus goes on to say that jokesters likewise hold out a scorpion in an empty eggshell, and comments that the *dipsas*, a kind of poisonous snake, similarly deceives by hiding itself in discarded ostrich shells. One of Erasmus' favourite Greek authors, Lucian, reports in *On the Dipsades* 6–8 that the *dipsas* of Libya hides near ostrich eggs in order to attack people who come collecting them for use as pots and hats.

27 For 'Father of spirits' cf Heb 12:9 and the paraphrase on that verse CWE 44 254 and n8. As Erasmus points out in his annotation *dabit spiritum bonum* (on 11:13), the Latin manuscripts he had seen all read 'good spirit' in this verse, while the Greek ones read 'holy spirit'; Erasmus prefers the Latin reading. He does not mention that the Greek goes on to say 'to those asking *for good things*'; the text of Luke does not indicate the object of the asking, though the parallel text, Matt 7:11, does. The paraphrase here steers an accommodating middle way between the two Gospel traditions. Similarly Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 474D–476A uses the Matthew passage to explain that Luke's 'good spirit' 'shows that the Holy Spirit is the fullness of the good things of God.'

28 The Gospel text of Luke says that the man was κωφός 'deaf, mute, deaf and mute' (in the Vulgate *mutus* 'mute'). Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 700B takes it as 'mute' and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 860B prefers 'deaf mute.' Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 475D, the *Gloss* (on 11:14), and Hugh of St Cher (on 11:14) 201r all point out that this is the same incident recounted in Matt 12:22–4, where the man is described as mute and blind. Erasmus incorporates the Matthew version here. On the other hand, in the annotation *et illud erat mutum* (on 11:14) he makes no reference to the version in Matthew, only chiding Lorenzo Valla for believing that *mutus* could not be a translation of κωφός; cf Valla *Annot in Lucam* 11.

leave, and it left.[29] There were some Jews present whose hearts the spirit of Satan possessed more dangerously than that impure demon had possessed the body of the man. Some of them maliciously charged that the miracle had been done by a demon, saying he was doing these things not by divine power but by the aid of Beelzebub, the prince of demons. Others again, still distrustful after having seen so many miracles, were demanding from him some notable sign from heaven, so that it would be plainly evident that his dealings were with God who lives in heaven and not with unclean spirits, whose sorceries are generally produced from the earth. And they were saying this to test the Lord, without the least intention of believing in him even if he did what was asked: whether he did it or not, they had their charges ready.

But when Jesus saw their godless thoughts he replied to their godless charge in this way: 'How can your charge stand? For we see that no kingdom can stand if it is beset by internal dissensions and at war with itself.[30] If that happens, it necessarily is deserted, and in the general collapse one house falls upon another.[31] But if what you are thinking is true, that with the aid of Beelzebub prince of demons I am casting out harmful demons, who assuredly are his companions and attendants, it follows that evil spirits are fighting among themselves, and some are being overcome by others. Now if Satan fights against Satan, how will his kingdom stand? You see demons being cast out, and you admit that the ones I cast out are harmful; then how do you draw the conclusion that this is done by the aid of Beelzebub rather than of God? Is Beelzebub in the habit of considering human welfare, and of driving out his own minions, through whom he wields his tyranny, from his own possessions? And yet if this were to happen, it proves that the kingdom of Satan will soon perish, and that the kingdom of God is at

* * * * *

29 Erasmus omits to paraphrase 'the dumb man spoke, and the people marvelled' from the end of verse 14.

30 Erasmus' emphatic expression here is in accord with his observation in the annotation *et illud erat mutum* (on 11:14) that Valla made another mistake in Greek when he understood 'every kingdom divided in itself' instead of 'against itself' in verse 17. Cf Valla *Annot in Lucam* 11.

31 Erasmus' annotation *desolabitur* (on 11:17) points out that the Vulgate text uses future tense verbs for 'be deserted' and 'fall' where the Greek uses present tense. In the paraphrase he adds 'it is necessary that' (here translated 'necessarily'), which in Latin is followed by the two verbs in subjunctive mood. Thus he obscures whether he intends present or future tense, since subjunctives in Latin do not normally have future forms distinct from present forms.

hand. I cast them out by just a word, I cast them out at no cost to you, I make no use of magic charms or sorceries. You cannot reproach the deed that was done; why do you prefer to ascribe the glory of the good work to Beelzebub rather than to God?

'Even if your hatred of me persuades you that I cast out demons by the aid of Beelzebub, what about these young men, your sons, whom you see doing the same thing?[32] By whose aid do they overcome demons? They are simple,[33] they are uneducated, they do not know the wicked arts of magicians, and yet they cast them out in my name. They do what they do only by trust in God. On that account when they are your judges your unbelief will be condemned. Their simplicity has believed, while your caution is at war with the glory of God. Since it is illogical, then, to say that an evil demon drives out an evil demon, and your sons cast out demons with the aid of no one else than the one with whose aid I cast them out, it is proved that I cast out evil demons by the power of the good God. For his Spirit is mightier than all wicked spirits. And he has nothing at all in common with them; indeed, he loves the salvation of the human race, and they seek its destruction. But if it is plain that by the power of God I accomplish what you see, then there is no doubt that God's kingdom has come among you, the kingdom John foretold was at hand.[34] Therefore it is right for you to join yourselves to it, and to withdraw from Satan's kingdom, which is soon to fall. You cannot be sharers in both kingdoms.[35]

* * * * *

32 Erasmus follows one branch of the exegetical tradition, in which 'your sons' of verse 19 are explained as Jesus' own disciples; cf Cyril, who adds 'in my name' to his own paraphrase, *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 701D (also in the *Catena aurea* on 11:19), and Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 477A. Bede adds that another interpretation is that Jewish exorcists are meant. The *Gloss* (on 11:19) says that the apostles 'knew that they had learned no wicked arts from the Lord,' while including Bede's alternate explanation; Hugh of St Cher (on 11:19–20) 201V understands the Jewish exorcists. Cf 9:49–50, Mark 16:17, Acts 16:18 for the power over demons exercised by Jesus' followers.

33 'Simple' (*simplex*) here in the sense obvious to the Pharisees of the story means no more than 'humble, ordinary,' even 'slightly foolish.' But in the longstanding tradition of Christian *simplicitas* 'simplicity,' 'singleness of heart,' it is a virtue and an attribute of faith; see eg Acts 2:46, Eph 6:5, Col 3:22. Erasmus draws on that sense in what follows and elaborates its meanings eg in the paraphrase on verses 34–6 below. Cf also CWE 44 191 n28, the paraphrase on 1 John 3:21.

34 Cf Matt 3:2.

35 Hugh of St Cher (on 11:17–20) 201V identifies Jesus' first two sentences in verses 17 and 18 as a syllogism, sets out the major and minor premises and

'Satan's war with God is non-negotiable. The issue will not be settled on any terms. Either he will win or he will be driven off by force. He will not surrender, he will not be taken back on set terms. Until now he has reigned with impunity. But a force more powerful than his tyranny has come. For one finger of God is more able to save the human race than are all the forces of Beelzebub together able to destroy it.[36] Hence you will have here the situation that usually arises between two generals, both powerful, both warlike, and putting all their confidence in arms. In such a case when a powerful armed man guards his own citadel, all that he possesses is secure. But if someone more powerful than he attacks him and defeats the armed man by arms, he will enter into no partnership with the first man but will drive him away and occupy his house. He will seize the arms in which the other trusted, he will pillage all his wealth and belongings and distribute

* * * * *

their conclusion, and proceeds to give an exposition of the reasoning, followed by another exposition of the reasoning in verses 19 and 20. Erasmus has also added the language of dialectic, logical argument, to Jesus' words in verses 17–18, setting out a series of conditions and conclusions and marking the logic of the consequences in the language: 'necessarily'; 'it follows that.' The language in the paraphrase on verses 19–20 also shows signs of rhetorical dialectic: 'it proves,' 'it is illogical to say,' 'it is proved,' 'it is plain,' 'there is no doubt,' 'therefore.' Cf the paraphrases on John 9:30 CWE 46 127 with n35 and 12:34 CWE 46 156 with n42. In the *Ecclesiastes* (1535), Erasmus says that dialectic, if used with restraint, can be helpful in preaching (LB V 905E–906E).

36 For the contrast between the powers of Satan and of God, cf eg Rom 5:15–21 and the paraphrase on that passage CWE 42 35–6. Luke's 'finger of God' in verse 20 is paralleled by 'spirit of God' at Matt 12:28. Augustine *De consensu evangelistarum* 2.38 says that the two mean the same thing, as does Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 704A–C (also cited in the *Catena aurea* on 11:20), who adds that the Holy Spirit is the finger of God as the Son is God's arm and hand. Hugh of St Cher (on 11:20) 202r adds the idea of power (*virtus*): the finger of God means the power of the Holy Spirit. Erasmus' paraphrase uses words meaning 'power' (*virtus*), 'mighty' and 'able' (*potens*), and 'aid' (*praesidium*, a military metaphor) in the rendering of verses 19 and 20, and culminates in 'the finger of God' appearing as the smallest instance of the power available to God yet mightier than all the powers of the devil. The description here of Satan's war with God, specifically used to introduce the paraphrase on the comparison of the two armed men in verses 21–2, besides being generally appropriate to what has been said in verses 17–18, may also owe something to the explanation in the exegetical tradition of the first armed man as Satan and the second, more powerful one as God; see eg Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 704D–705A, the *Gloss* (on 11:21–2), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 861C–D, Hugh of St Cher (on 11:21) 202r, and Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 41 PG 57 447–8 (on Matt 12:25–32).

them among his own soldiers.[37] Now it is up to you to determine on whose side you choose to stand, the side of God, who is the more powerful, or the side of Satan, who will soon be driven out. If you have peace with Satan you have war with God. If you have peace with God, there is no compromise with Satan. You must do battle in the camp of one or the other. The time does not allow for tolerance of the idle. Whoever is not on my side is my opponent, and does harm in exactly this, that he does not give support though he ought to; and whoever does not gather with me scatters.'

But since the Jews credited themselves with a reputation for righteousness, and in this self-confidence either slighted the gospel teaching or even shunned it, he put forward a riddle[38] to indicate that there is a weightier condemnation for those who, though they have made some progress towards righteousness, slip back into their former crimes than for those who, never having known the light of the gospel truth, have continued blindly in their faults.[39] For the Jewish people was set apart from the idolatrous gentiles by the Law, but then, sliding back to its earlier misdeeds, finally sank to such impiety that whatever sins their ancestors had committed in killing the prophets and conspiring against Moses they renewed seven times more

* * * * *

37 The annotation *auferet* (on 11:22) notes that the two Greek verbs for 'take away' and 'distribute' are both in the present tense of customary occurrence, not future tense predicting some future event, as the Vulgate translator has rendered them. The paraphrase, however, ignores this point and uses a series of future-tense verbs in its version.

38 *aenigma*, a common term in the *Paraphrases* (variously translated in CWE) for the teaching technique by which Scripture in general and Jesus in particular say what is not clear on first hearing so as to draw the listener into an effort to puzzle out the meaning and thus learn it more thoroughly. Cf the paraphrases on John 1:30, 4:10, 6:51 CWE 46 30, 55 and n16, 86, on Acts 1:6 CWE 50 5 and n6, and on Heb 9:8 CWE 44 235–6 and n15.

39 The patristic and medieval exegetical tradition uniformly regarded this parable as referring in the first instance to the Jews, who received the gifts of the Law and settlement in a land of their own but slid back into their former sins and eventually (in most of the tradition) compounded those sins by killing the Son of God. Cf Origen as cited in the *Catena aurea* on 11:24–6, Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1811D–1812A, Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 43 PG 57 459–62 (on Matt 12:38–45), Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 705B–D (also cited in the *Catena aurea* on 11:26), Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 479A–B, the *Gloss* (on 11:24–6), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 864A–B, and Hugh of St Cher (on 11:24) 202V. Among these Cyril, the *Gloss*, and Hugh all allude, as does this sentence in Erasmus, to 2 Pet 2:21. Erasmus' application, just below, of the parable not only to Jews but also to backsliding Christians is paralleled in Ambrose, Chrysostom, Bede, the *Gloss*, and Hugh.

wickedly against the Son of God and against his disciples. Yet this parable also applies to every single person who has been once and for all washed clean from his former sins by baptism, once and for all freed from the evil spirit of this world by the words of the gospel,[40] but who holds God's gift lightly and makes no effort to be always advancing towards more perfect things. When such a one has slipped back to his former life, baptism and knowledge of the sacred teaching will bring him no other benefit than that he calls down upon himself a weightier condemnation on the day of judgment, by the addition, that is, of ingratitude and malice to his former errors. The parable goes like this:

'When an unclean spirit leaves a person, driven out by God's might, since it has a nagging desire to do harm, it goes about in dry and barren places seeking rest. When it does not find rest anywhere, it says to itself, "I will go back into my house, which I left." So returning to the house it finds it swept out indeed, but empty.[41] When it sees this, it goes off and joins to itself seven other spirits more wicked than it was itself, and with such a company moves into the house, clean indeed but unguarded and armed with none of the defences of gospel virtues. For ornate ceremonies do present the appearance of godliness, but since they are empty images of real things, they do not ward off an assault by ungodly spirits but are the occasion for greater ungodliness. The same thing happens to the person who, cleansed of one demon, becomes subject to seven worse ones.'

While Jesus was saying these and many other things to the general throng, one woman, marvelling at such wise and powerful words, raised her voice from the middle of the crowd and said, 'Blessed is the womb of the woman who carried you, and blessed are the nurse's breasts that you

* * * * *

40 *sermo evangelicus*. See n12 above for *sermo*, and also the *Paraphrase on John* CWE 46 15 n16, as well as *sermo* in the Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited in that volume.

41 In the annotation *scopis mundatam* (on 11:25) Erasmus says that the Greek manuscripts add καὶ κεκοσμημένον 'and adorned, put in order' (*et ornatam*), 'which perhaps has been added here from the other evangelists.' The addition was also in some Vulgate traditions of his day and later, including the Clementine Vulgate; see Weber on the passage. Matt 12:44 is the parallel passage; it reads 'empty, swept, and put in order.' 'Put in order' is *exornatam* in Matthew. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 478D says that Matthew means adorned hypocritically with pretended virtues. Erasmus omits any equivalent to (*ex*)*ornatam* in the paraphrase on verse 25 itself, but accommodates the Vulgate reading by the punning remark two sentences below about 'ornate ceremonies' (*ornamenta ceremoniarum*).

sucked.' The voice of this woman, who is a symbol of the church, was raised against the slandering synagogue.[42] And Jesus did not reject her declaration but perfected it,[43] saying, 'Truly blessed are those who hear the word of God and keep it in their heart lest it slip away, so that someday it may produce the fruit of everlasting salvation. That is much more blessed than to have carried a body in a body, or to have fed it on milk. Only one woman was able to bear or nurse [my body]; but this blessedness can be shared by all.'

But when an even thicker crowd of people gathered at these words, Jesus undertook to reply to those who had been demanding a sign from heaven[44] – as if what he had done so far was ordinary and they considered it not befitting a great prophet that such things be performed for common folk, and as if they considered that the Pharisees themselves, being learned and exalted men, were owed the demonstration of some special wonder from heaven. Now they said this by no means with honest intentions but testing him, so that if he did not show them a sign they would

* * * * *

42 The paraphrase takes the womb and the breasts of verse 27 as suggesting two separate women, the mother and the wet-nurse. Erasmus' usual sources have nothing to say on this point, except for Hugh of St Cher (on 11:27) 203r, who claims in no uncertain terms that Jesus, like Moses, was nursed only at the breast of his mother and no one else. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 479C–480B and the interlinear *Gloss* (on 11:27) also viewed the woman who made the declaration of verse 27 as a symbol of the church speaking out against the synagogue or among the gentiles.

43 The careful statement that Jesus perfected the woman's declaration rather than rejecting it reflects Erasmus' thinking in the annotation *quinimo* (on 11:28) that the connective *quinimo* 'rather' in Latin (μενοῦν γε in the Greek text) neither denies nor refutes what has gone before but introduces a more definite point. A similar observation that Jesus is not taking anything away from his mother here is made by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 11:28) and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 864D. Hugh of St Cher (on 11:28) 203r comes to the same conclusion as the annotation after a detailed discussion of how *quinimo* is to be understood. Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:28) has a brief note on *quinimo* to the same effect.

44 'An even thicker crowd of people gathered' (*densior etiam hominum multitudo concurreret*) accommodates both the Vulgate *concurrere* 'gather' in verse 29 and the comment in the annotation *turbis autem concurrentibus* (on 11:29) that the Greek word translated by *concurrere* really means 'to heap up,' 'cluster together,' 'thicken.'

Erasmus interprets the interchange that follows in verses 29–36 as Jesus' reply to those who had asked for a sign from heaven (in verse 16) to disprove his connection to Beelzebub. The same connection had been made by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 480C, Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 865A, Hugh of St Cher (on 11:29) 203v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:29).

allege that the other things had been done with Beelzebub's help; if he did show them a sign, then they would find something else in him to criticize. So he said, 'This is an evil nation[45] and not at all honest. It has seen so many wonders, and now it asks for a sign not to believe in but to criticize. Yet it will not get what it is fraudulently seeking but will receive the sign that it deserves; there will be given not what it can criticize but what can prove its guilt. For it will be given the sign of the prophet Jonah. The people of Nineveh did penance[46] for their sins in response to Jonah's preaching, though he had done no miracle among them. This nation cannot be softened to penitence by any miracles, by any good deeds; yet there is one here who is greater than Jonah the prophet, at whom they marvel because he was taken by a whale, lived in its belly for three days and three nights, and then, given up for dead, suddenly reappeared alive.[47] There will be something like this but more marvellous; the Son of Man will be buried in the core of the earth for three days, but contrary to the expectation of all evil people, on the third day the earth will give back alive the dead man she had received.

'And so at the last judgment this nation, which thinks everyone inferior to itself, which considers itself to hold the citadel of religion, will be condemned by many nations that seemed to be most hostile to religion. The Queen of Sheba will rise at the judgment with the men of this nation and will condemn them because she, a woman and a stranger to the teaching of the Law, still journeyed long from the far ends of the earth to Jerusalem to listen to the wisdom of Solomon. And yet in this place there is some-

* * * * *

45 The paraphrase has *natio* 'nation' here and in the next several sentences, not *generatio* 'generation' as in the Vulgate text of verses 30 and 32, in line with the paraphrase's interpretation that the saying is against the Jews specifically. See n63 below.

46 'do penance' (*poenitentiam agere*) anticipates and perhaps accommodates the use of that phrase in the Vulgate text of verse 32. Usually (and in the paraphrase on verse 32) Erasmus prefers *resipiscere* 'repent' to translate the Greek μετανοεῖν; see the paraphrases on Acts 2:38 CWE 50 22 and n90, and on 1 Tim 2:2 CWE 44 13 and n5 for full discussion. In the annotation *poenitentiam agite* (on Matt 3:2) he explains that repentance is a transformation of the mind, not the performance of acts of penance.

47 Erasmus here interprets the 'sign of Jonah' as both the preaching that led the Ninevites to repent and Jonah's miraculous rescue from the belly of the whale, which is not suggested by Luke but is a part of the parallel passage in Matt 12:39–40. So also do Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 865A and Hugh of St Cher (on 11:29–30) 203v. Erasmus had cited the Jonah story as an interpretive key in the paraphrase on John 2:18–19.

thing greater than Solomon; and what is here is scorned. The men of Nineveh, no followers of the Law but worshippers of idols, will contest with[48] this nation at the judgment and will condemn it because they did penance for their sins at the preaching of an unknown foreigner who recommended himself to them by no miracles and no good deeds. And look, there is something present here greater than Jonah himself; yet they are not moved to repentance.'

Now though there were many among the Jews for whom the light of the gospel only blinded their hearts the more, it still would not have been right for the truth to be suppressed hereafter, when knowledge of it was going to draw great numbers to eternal salvation. For the stubborn wickedness of unbelievers ought not be an obstacle for good people. And so the truth must be brought forward into public view, to the worse destruction of the wicked and to the salvation of the good. 'No one,' he said, 'lights a lamp and hides it in a secret place, or covers it with a basket over it; he sets it on a lampstand, to light the house for those who wish to enter. What a house is without a lamp, what a body is without eyes, that is what a heart without knowledge of the truth is, knowledge that comes about through simple[49] faith. If your eye is simple and not flawed by any of the lusts of this world, it will receive the light of eternal truth, and your whole body will enjoy this light and nowhere stumble. But if the body's eye is flawed, the whole body will be in bondage to the dark.

'Now judgment and the principles for living are by faith.[50] Here is the wellspring of all good things, and if it is flawed, everything else necessarily

* * * * *

48 The Vulgate text says of both the Queen of Sheba and the men of Nineveh that each will 'arise with' (*surgere cum*) this generation (or, as Erasmus says, this nation) at the judgment. Erasmus echoes the Vulgate wording in the case of the Queen of Sheba (*consurgere cum*) but emphasizes the point that the 'rising' is of a competitive kind by varying the expression to 'contest with' (*contendere cum*) here.

49 'Simple' is *simplex* both here and in the next sentence; cf n33 above. In the annotation *si oculus tuus nequam* (on Matt 6:23) Erasmus defines the (physical) 'simple eye' as one that is free from the various medical conditions that impair sight.

50 'Judgment ... by faith' (*ex fide iudicium*) is possibly an allusion to Hab 2:4, 'The righteous shall live by his faith,' quoted at Rom 1:17, Gal 3:11, and Heb 10:38 and often alluded to elsewhere. Here Erasmus speaks of *iudicium* (more usually 'judgment,' 'just judgment') rather than *iustitia* (usually 'righteousness,' 'justification,' as in Phil 3:9). He may be influenced in this sentence by Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:33–4), who speaks at length of right intention (*intentio recta*), guided by faith and love, as that which directs our actions to their proper ends. See the next note and chapter 24 n45.

is flawed. See to it, then, that the eye by which the truth is discerned is pure and sound in you, so that this very member, which alone is capable of light and provides light for the whole body, is not in bondage to the dark. For if this which is the crown and root of all good works is flawed, even the things that seem good are not good. Conversely, what seems to the Pharisees to be evil will not be evil if the source from which they come is sound.[51] What a lamp is to a cleansed eye the divine word is to the heart cleansed from base desires by simplicity of faith.[52] Whatever does not come from faith is sin.[53] But if the eye of your body is sound, illuminated by the lamp of gospel truth, it will bestow its light on all the members so that in no part of the body is there any darkness, since the eye looks out for all. So whatever the hand does, or the foot, or the other members, will not be in bondage to the dark,[54] but the whole body will be lighted as the whole house is lighted when the brightness of the lamp provides light for all.'

An incident followed as if to make plain what the Lord taught. Now the Pharisees had a flawed eye and, locating righteousness in physical ceremonies, they neglected the things that are not seen except with the pure

* * * * *

51 From 'what a house is without a lamp' to this point, the paraphrase expands and explains verses 33–5 by adding to the analogies 'lamp is to house as eye is to body' a third term: 'as faith-born knowledge of truth is to heart.' Erasmus follows a well-established exegetical tradition that also asserts in relation to this passage that the works that are the products of faith-born knowledge will be good even if they do not appear so in purely human terms, and conversely that if faith is imperfect or flawed, the resultant works will be evil even if they appear good. The tradition is represented, in whole or in part, by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1812D, Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 20 (on Matt 6:22–3) PG 57 291, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 481D–482B, the interlinear and marginal *Gloss* (on 11:34), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 868A, among a variety of possible interpretations in Hugh of St Cher (on 11:33–6) 204r, and in Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:33).

52 At this point, and with some justification in the less than lucid redirection of the imagery in verse 36, Erasmus shifts the relation of lamp and eye from being analogous in function to one of actor and acted-upon. To explain the latter relation Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1812D quotes Ps 119:105, 'thy word [*verbum* in the Vulgate] is a lamp to my feet and a light to my path,' and John 1:9, 'the true light that enlightens every man.' Hugh of St Cher (on 11:33–6) 204r includes the explanation and the reference to Ps 119, and adds a reference to Prov 6:23, 'the commandment is a lamp and the teaching a way of life.' Erasmus' term for the 'divine word' here is *sermo divinus*; cf n40 above.

53 Cf Rom 14:23.

54 Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:34) notes that 'the eye directs the feet in walking and the hand in writing,' particulars that may have influenced Erasmus' turn of phrase here.

eyes for which the lamp of gospel truth provides light. So they thought that the light was precisely where the darkness was; they especially stumbled precisely when they thought they were proceeding handsomely; they judged that there was serious wrongdoing exactly where there was none, but where there was a serious fault they did not think there was any. For they had eyes flawed by superstitious regard for the Law, by ignorance, scorn, jealousy, greed, hypocrisy, and other ills.

So then: a Pharisee invited Jesus to dine with him. Jesus did not refuse, withholding himself from no one so that he could draw everyone to him. But when the Lord had taken his place at table without washing – and that was contrary to the practice of the Pharisees – the Pharisee began to wonder privately what the reason was that the Lord had not washed before taking his place.[55] And exactly there, from a matter which does not make a person either good or bad, arises that which is truly forever bad. For the ceremonies of the Pharisees, which consist in physical matters, have the property of giving rise to carping criticisms, evil suspicions, twisted judgments, dissension, hatred, and quarrels. Jesus, who understood that this is the chief plague of gospel godliness, sharply refuted the pharisaic superstition, saying, 'Moses had once prescribed some rituals of purification, yet they were a type and image of cleansing the mind. For that is the concern of whatever the Law foreshadowed in its figures. But now that it is right for the shadows of the old Law to pass gradually away in the full light of the truth, you Pharisees, who profess a perfect knowledge of the Law, only embrace that part of the Law which does the least to effect true godliness. And not only do you sin in embracing the flesh of the Law to the neglect of its spirit, but you also add physical ceremonies and your own petty regulations and want to be considered holier than the commandments of God.[56]

* * * * *

55 In the paraphrase on verses 38–41 Erasmus uses only the various forms of *lavare* for 'wash,' though the Vulgate uses *baptizare*, the Latinized form of the verb in the Greek text, in verse 38 and *mundare* 'cleanse' in verse 39. The annotation *baptizatus esset* (on 11:38) inquires why the Latin translator has not preferred to use *lavare*, since it is a question of simple handwashing (and, by implication, not a matter of Christian baptism). Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:38) also notes that *baptizare* here meant only '*lavare* in the Jewish custom'; the two verbs are used apparently interchangeably in the Vulgate version of the parallel account at Mark 7:1–5.

56 For 'the flesh of the Law' (*caro legis*), cf Erasmus' explanation of 'flesh' in the *Enchiridion* CWE 66 70. The phrase recurs eg in the *Paraphrase on Acts*; see the General Index to CWE 50 under 'flesh of the Law.' Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 712B–C points out that while the law of Moses did require ritual washings of various kinds, including of the priest Aaron and his Levite descendants, washing before eating was not part of the prescriptions. Cf eg Exod 29:4,

'True purity is located in innocence of heart. But you for your part repeatedly wash your body, you wash cups and bowls, external things and ones that contribute nothing to true godliness of heart. Meanwhile your inner and more important part goes unwashed, abounding in filth abominable to God, robbery and injustice. You believe that you are sullied if you drink from an unwashed cup or eat from an unwashed bowl; and do you think you are pure if the cup and the bowl and their contents have been obtained by robbery and deception? You fools and your warped judgment! Did not he who created the body also create the heart? Well, if purity is so dear to you, you ought to have purified the whole person. But it was right that concern for the part that is more important take first place. As it is, you flatter yourselves that you are amply pure if you wash your body and your dishes with water, while your heart, stained with deceptions, robberies, hatred, jealousy, self-seeking, and other plagues, you cleanse with charitable giving – which, though you do it for show, you think suffices for absolute purity of heart![57]

* * * * *

30:17–21 and the various purifications in Leviticus 11–17. The paraphrase adds to Luke's account the limited requirements of authentic Mosaic law mentioned by Cyril and the references to the 'tradition of the elders' (not a part of Mosaic law) in Matt 15:1–6 and Mark 7:1–13. Hugh of St Cher (on 11:37–8) 204v briefly remarks that the Lord rebukes his Pharisee host for preferring human traditions to the commandments of God.

57 Verse 41 presents two problems to readers, like Erasmus, of both the Greek and the Latin texts. The Greek text reads πλὴν τὰ ἔνοντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην 'but give for alms those things which are within' (RSV). The traditional Vulgate, however, read *verumtamen quod superest date eleemosynam* 'but yet that which remaineth, give alms' (DV). In the annotation *quod superest* (on 11:41) Erasmus points out that *quod superest* 'the remainder' translates τὰ ἔνοντα 'the things within,' though such a meaning is far from obvious. He prefers Theophylact's interpretation. Indeed Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 869A says that τὰ ἔνοντα means τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῖν 'your means,' 'your resources.' Erasmus adds that Theophylact seems to read τὰ ἔνοντα in apposition to ἐλεημοσύνην 'alms,' but that one could also understand the phrase to mean '*according to* your means,' and that is what the Latin translator has done: since what has passed [ie the means you have spent] is no longer 'within,' the translator said 'the remainder.' In his own translation Erasmus preserved the Vulgate version; the paraphrase avoids the expression altogether.

The Gospel text, however, presents a further problem: the Greek δότε ἐλεημοσύνην, as Erasmus points out in the annotation *verumtamen date eleemosynam* (on 11:41), could be taken as either imperative ('give alms!') or indicative ('you are giving alms'), parallel to 'you clean' in verse 39. Erasmus says the second possibility means 'Do you think that you are freed from all robbery if you hand over a bit of the proceeds to the poor?' in line with Jesus' remark at

'Woe to you Pharisees, who under pretext of religion carry on your own business, tithing even the cheapest greens, mint and rue, as if God cares only about priests and Levites. Meanwhile, in opposition to God's intention, you deal fraudulently with your neighbour and do not help the poor, but envy the more fortunate and oppress the weak. Oh, judgment truly perverse! It was indeed proper not to overlook the things that the Law commanded to be kept in a physical way for a time; but the things that God especially wants done, that are at all times good and pleasing to him, ought particularly to have been fulfilled. You scrupulously care for what pertains to your advantage; you neglect what pertains to helping your neighbour.[58] Woe to you Pharisees, who on the outside parade the picture of sanctity but on the inside are swollen with self-seeking, grasping at the more honourable seats in the synagogues; and you love to hear those grand titles "Rabbi, Rabbini"[59] from people who greet you in public. You act only to please human eyes and consider as nothing the fact that in the filth of your heart you displease the eyes of God. And woe to you and your hypocrisy, for you are like the tombs of the dead, which on the outside gleam with whitewash, inscriptions, and various pictures, though inside they are filled

* * * * *

Matt 6:1 that the Pharisees give alms where they can be seen by others; to him the first sense is incongruent with Jesus' reproach of the Pharisees in this passage and his call for inner purity. The paraphrase, like the annotation, prefers to read the indicative. For other of Erasmus' comments on the general issue of indicative versus imperative verb forms, cf the General Index to CWE 56 under 'grammar.'

58 The annotation *mentam* (on 11:42) points out that mint and rue are cheap greens not necessary to human life, and that once again the Pharisees are being reproved for their outward performance of obligations as a show of piety as well as for their neglect of God's justice, that is, a truly pious disposition of the heart, and God's love, that is, assistance to all, even enemies, in the matters that pertain to their salvation. He ends the annotation with criticism of those who endow monasteries and religious houses while neglecting the poor, even sometimes relatives and children. Some such thought may also underlie the paraphrase's reference here to priests and Levites.

59 Erasmus borrows here from Matt 23:7. In the annotation *nolite vocari rabbi* on that verse, he says that some Greek manuscripts double the title and say 'rabbi, rabbi,' as Judas does also (at Mark 14:45, a reading known to the AV translators). He explains that repetition of the title is apparently a Hebrew practice to indicate honour, as when Jesus himself said, 'Not everyone who says to me "Lord, Lord"' (Matt 7:21; cf Luke 6:46 and the annotation on Rom 8:15 CWE 56 211). For the form *rabbini*, the spelling of the lifetime editions, representing ῥαββουνί *rabboni* at Mark 10:51 and John 20:16, LB here has *rabboni*.

with every kind of rottenness.[60] And what is visible charms the eyes of the passing people; yet it misleads about what the tombs conceal. But humans can be misled; God sees into the inmost recesses of the heart.'

As the Lord was saying these and other things with great sternness against the counterfeit sanctity of the Pharisees, one of the lawyers, endeavouring to curb Jesus' plain speaking, said to him, 'When you say these things against the Pharisees, you insult us too.' A heart aware of its own wrongdoing does not endure plain speech, and it fears that an example of plain speaking against others may rebound against itself.[61] But Jesus, eternal truth that does not know how to flatter since it alone is without blame, yet that rebukes for no other purpose except to heal evils, replied to the lawyer, 'If what I say applies to all of you as well, as you say, then there will be woe for you lawyers too, for, not content with exacting from the common folk every petty observance of the Law, you also add many things on your own above and beyond the Law's authority; and adding burden to burden, you put an impossible load on the shoulders of the simple. At the same time you indulge yourselves, being so far from touching the things with which you burden others that you do not even keep those chief things without which the rest are of no benefit.[62]

* * * * *

60 The text of 11:44 diverges considerably from its parallel at Matt 23:27. In Matthew the tombs are whitewashed and handsome to look at; in Luke they are not visible at all and people walk over them in ignorance. See Fitzmyer AB Luke 949 for discussion. In the exegetical tradition Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 485B, followed by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 11:44) and Hugh of St Cher (on 11:44) 205r, stays close to the text of Luke and says that the tombs have the appearance of ordinary ground. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1814B–C, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 716B–C (also cited in the *Catena aurea* on 11:42–4), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 11:44), however, followed here by Erasmus, suppress the Luke version and make reference to the superficial attractiveness of the tombs. Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 872A–B steers a middle course, mentioning marble paving over which people walk. Erasmus seems to add on his own the inscriptions and pictures, *tituli* and *picturae*, in the paraphrase.

61 The *Gloss* (on 11:45) and Hugh of St Cher (on 11:45) 205r also note that the lawyer's guilty conscience is his motive for speaking out.

62 Cyril as cited in the *Catena aurea* on 11:46, Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 872B, and Hugh of St Cher (on 11:46) 205r say that the lawyers do not themselves follow the rules they enjoin on others, though Theophylact and Hugh do not comment on the lawyers' own non-observance of Mosaic law; Cyril does. Erasmus' 'impossible load' (*sarcinam importabilem*), more literally 'a load that cannot be carried,' borrows language from Matt 23:4, *onera importabilia* 'burdens that cannot be carried.' In the annotation *non tangitis sarcinas* (on 11:46) Erasmus notes that the compound verb *attingere* 'touch' would have

'Woe to you, who for a show of your own virtue build memorials to the prophets, though it was your ancestors who killed most of them. So it is that you reveal your own wickedness by the very means by which you strive to conceal it. For while you adorn the memorials of the prophets you admit the reprehensibility of those who killed the ones whose memory is sacrosanct to you, descendants of their killers. Then since you yourselves are scheming against the prophets of this age, far superior to their predecessors, worse things than your ancestors carried out against the prophets of old, do you not make it plain that blinded by greed, self-seeking, jealousy, and hatred you knowingly approve the wicked deeds of your ancestors, which you not only copy but even strive to surpass? So many times has the goodness of God called you back to repentance, and you have always wickedly raged against those who were bringing you the truth, truth that was hated for no other reason except that it opposed your evil desires.

'And so the wisdom of God, which governs all things by his indescribable purpose, before punishing the stubborn wickedness of this race determined to leave nothing untried by which they might be led to better ways. Yet once both the immeasurable goodness of God and the Jews' insuperable perversity have been made plain to all, the Jews will pay a penalty as much more dreadful as they have been allowed to go on longer and have been summoned to penitence by greater kindnesses. Hence the wisdom of God has spoken to itself in this way: "What more shall I do for this unmanageable nation?[63] I have sent Moses, I have sent many ancient prophets, I have sent John the Baptist. They made a conspiracy against Moses; they either killed or persecuted the prophets; they paid no heed even to John the Baptist, more than a prophet; and advising them well was not without its penalty for him. The Son of Man has come, and they are scheming his destruction. I will send them the last prophets of all, to interpret the Law spiritually; I will send them apostles who will be mighty in miracles, who

* * * * *

been a more precise choice than the simple *tangere* 'touch' and better suited to the Greek word (προσψαύειν) it translates; accordingly he uses *attingere* here, as in his translation, in the phrase 'so far from touching.'

63 'Nation' here and below replaces 'generation' in the Gospel text of verses 50 and 51. Cf n45 above. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 485C, followed by the marginal and interlinear *Gloss* (on 11:50) and Hugh of St Cher (on 11:50) 205V, explains that in the language of Scripture 'generation' often refers to only two classes of people: the good, born of God, as in John 1:13, and the evil, those called in John 8:44 the devil's offspring. But the latter passage refers exclusively to Jews. For similarities to the words given to God here, cf eg Micah 6:3–4, Jer 7:25, and Luke 20:9–16 and the paraphrase on that passage.

will freely do good to all, who will offer to all salvation obtainable by the least trouble, that is, by faith." They will not heed even these, but will persecute them, torment them, banish them, and even kill some.[64] That is how much their wickedness will overcome God's goodness.

'At last, when their wickedness has grown to the point that they have surpassed, not just equalled, the evil deeds of all ages, then divine vengeance will fall upon them, and satisfaction will be required of them for the blood of all the prophets that has been shed since the creation of the world, that is, from the blood of Abel, who was the first of all to be murdered by a jealous brother, all the way to the blood of Zechariah the priest, son of Jehoiada, who when he was recalling the throng to sounder purposes was stoned in the uproar of the people between the temple and the altar. And as Zechariah was dying and testifying his innocence and their ungodliness, he said, "May the Lord see and avenge!"[65] Now the time of this vengeance is near. One nation will as it were pay the penalty for all the crimes of its ancestors, for it has gone beyond whatever wickedness there was in them all. What divine wisdom foretold would happen will without a doubt come to pass. The Jews of this age, since they surpass the rebelliousness, the perversity, and the cruelty of all the ancient Jews, will be as dreadfully punished as if they alone had carried out whatever their ancestors had wickedly planned in their various generations.

'Again and again woe to you lawyers, for though you profess familiarity with the Law, which is spiritual, and claim for yourselves the key of knowledge, which ought to have opened the way into the kingdom of heaven, you nonetheless not only have not entered yourselves but when others wished to enter you have shut them out. For as long as you inter-

* * * * *

64 These anticipated activities of the apostles and the responses of the Jews summarize much of the narrative of Acts and may have broader applications in Erasmus' mind as well.

65 Erasmus bypasses a story reported by some that the Zechariah meant is the father of John the Baptist, who was killed by the mob for letting the pregnant mother of Christ stand in the virgins' place in the Temple. Instead he follows the other view, represented in discussions of this passage by Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 23 PL 26 180A–181A, Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 872D, and Hugh of St Cher (on 11:51) 205V, that Zechariah is the son of Jehoiada, whose story is told in 2 Chron 24:20–2. He deals with both stories in the annotation *Zacharia filio Barachiae* (on Matt 23:35), where he also discusses the further problem that at Matt 23:35 Zechariah is called the son of Barachiah; the annotation reports Jerome's suggestion that Barachiah is a scribal error and Chrysostom's that Barachiah had a second name, Jehoiada.

pret the Law wrongly you oppose that which is the chief point of the whole Law.'[66]

In reaction to remarks of this kind, somewhat bitter indeed because of the plain speaking of the truth, yet wholesome if they had been willing to swallow the medicine, both the Pharisees and the lawyers were greatly offended. But since they silently acknowledged to themselves that what was said was quite true, they disguised their feelings, to be sure, before the people, but meanwhile paid close attention to all Jesus' sayings. They were hunting for what might come out of his mouth from which they could contrive an accusation against him.[67] Thus they would appear to prosecute him not from some private enmity but out of zeal for religion and godliness. For the Pharisees' hypocrisy is also characterized by devising nothing so wicked that it is not veiled in a pretence of godliness.

Chapter 12

But since our Lord Jesus knew that the wickedness of the Pharisees, scribes, and lawyers was incurable, he wanted to expose their hypocrisy openly so that no one could be unwittingly deceived by their pretence. Large crowds now surrounded him, so many that they were trampling on one another,

* * * * *

66 Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 721B says that the key of knowledge is the Law, which by shadows and types sketches for us the mystery of Christ, and justification by faith in Christ. Similarly Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 873A–C says that the key is the Law, which is a door to Christ, while another possible meaning is faith. Erasmus here speaks allusively of Christ as the point of the Law. Cf eg Matt 5:17 and John 4:21–6, 5:45–6, and the paraphrases on those passages LB VII 28C–F and CWE 46 58 and 74.

67 The Vulgate text of verse 53 says that the Pharisees began to 'oppress his mouth' (DV) as a translation of the Greek ἀποστοματίζειν or ἀποστομίζειν 'interrogate closely,' 'quiz.' But as Erasmus says in the long annotation *et os eius opprimere* (on 11:53), the Latin translator seems to have mistaken this word for ἐπιστομίζειν 'stop someone's mouth.' The correct meaning, Erasmus says, is also more consistent with the preceding and following context. He supports his explanation of the word's meaning with a quotation from Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 873D–876B, who says that the Pharisees' purpose was to confuse Jesus with a flood of questions and thus make him look like a fool, and also with a reference to Valla's similar explanation in *Annot in Lucam* 11. But it is a rare word and the meaning is not entirely beyond question, says Erasmus; perhaps the reading should in fact be ἐπιστομίζειν. In the paraphrase, however, by saying that they listened to Jesus' words in order to frame an accusation against him, he follows his understanding of the Greek text, not the Vulgate version he knows.

when he began to say to his disciples, 'Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. Endeavour to be what you want to be thought to be.[1] From now on nothing false will be able to stay hidden long. A time will come that will bring out into the open both your innocence and their wickedness. But nothing is now so covered that it will not soon have to be disclosed; and nothing is so hidden that it will not later come to people's knowledge.[2] So take care that your whole life is without deceit and that you do not say or do or think anything, even in solitude, that you do not want to be known to all. For whatever you now say secretly in darkness will one day be told in full light, and what you now whisper in your bedchamber will one day be proclaimed on the housetops.

'The truth will offend godless people who are disguised in a semblance of godliness, but do not let the fear of any evil draw you away from the honest preaching of the gospel truth. The worst of their evils is that they kill, but the body only. Yet I say to you, my friends, rely on my aid and do not let yourselves be at all frightened by the cruelty of those who, having schemed all sorts of things, can kill the body; for once that is done they have no further way to do harm. Yet whoever is killed for my sake does not die.

'If you are determined to take counsel from fear, it is right for a lesser fear to give way to a greater, and for him rather to be feared who can destroy the entire person with a nod. If you want him pointed out to you, it is God who alone has the power, when he has killed the body, also to send the soul to Gehenna.[3] Do not let the cruelty of the ungodly cause fear, for they can harm only lightly or not at all, and cannot do even

* * * * *

1 *Tales esse studete quales haberi vultis.* Erasmus echoes here a classical, as well as Christian, opposition to hypocritical behaviour, as he had also in the paraphrase on John 8:12 CWE 46 107. Plato *Republic* 2.361B, quoting Aeschylus, speaks of 'the man who does not want to appear but to be good'; Sallust *Bellum Catilinae* 54.6 says of Cato *esse quam videri bonus malebat* 'he preferred to be rather than to appear good.'

2 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 487C, the *Gloss* (on 12:2), Hugh of St Cher (on 12:2) 206V, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 12:2) also remark that the approaching disclosure will be of both the goodness of Jesus' followers and the wickedness of Jesus' opponents. Bede, the *Gloss*, and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 877A point out that the disclosure will happen not in the present age but at the Judgment Day.

3 The exegetical tradition specifies that it is God who is able to kill both the body and the soul; cf Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1815C, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 488B, the interlinear *Gloss* (on 12:5), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 880A, Hugh of St Cher (on 12:5) 206V.

this except with God's permission. But if in dread of human beings you become less than wholehearted in preaching the gospel, though you avoid trivial and temporary ills, you will fall into eternal evils. So let one nail drive out another, and let fear of God dispel fear of human beings.[4] Do not be afraid that you will perish before your time. Everyone must die in any case; and it makes no difference how long you have lived, but how well.[5] Anyone who meets death for my name's sake departs from here in blessedness. And it will not happen before the time appointed for you by the Father, so that you will live no longer even if fear of death puts you in the gravest torment. Your Father will take care that everyone die at his proper time.

'Though these things seem to occur by chance and accident, nothing will happen to you except by permission of the Father, who cares for all your affairs. What is cheaper or more despised than one little sparrow? Isn't it possible to buy five for two pennies? Yet God cares for them, and not even one of the most worthless of living creatures perishes without the Father's knowledge. As for you few, whom he has chosen from all to illuminate the glory of his name, he is so far from neglecting you that he even has the hairs of your head numbered. It would be impious to fight against his will! What is more, he will want nothing except what he knows will be best. And so cast all your worry about your life on him. He who cares for the little sparrows will not neglect you, who are so much better than all the sparrows.[6]

* * * * *

4 Cf *Adagia* I ii 4: *Clavum clavo pellere* 'To drive out one nail by another.' This adage is one of Erasmus' favourites; cf eg the paraphrases on 20:3 below, John 13:8 CWE 46 161 and Mark 2:12 CWE 49 36.

5 The thought is a commonplace of Greek and Roman philosophy, as of other ethical systems. One of the most famous instances is in Socrates' principles for living the ethical life, expressed in Plato *Apology*, especially 28B, and *Crito* 48B, the latter in phrasing much like Erasmus' sentence here. Cf the *Paraclesis* LB V 142A, where Erasmus summarizes the views of ancient Stoics and of Socrates to the same effect.

6 Erasmus' paraphrase on 12:7, beginning at the sentence 'As for you few, whom he has chosen,' draws out a point like one he had also made before the paraphrase on the Lord's Prayer in chapter 11: Jesus is directing his teaching specifically to the disciples (who according to 12:1 are his audience) and their future roles as successors to him in preaching and teaching. The point is not found explicitly in the exegetical tradition; even Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 877C–D, who comments that 'you my friends' does not mean everyone, does explain that it means those to whom Rom 8:35, 'Who shall separate us from the love of God?' applies. Erasmus here does not, as he often does elsewhere, allude to a more general application to all Christians.

'And so, mindful that the way to eternal bliss is through these temporary sufferings, do not be unfaithful to the proclamation of my name from fear of the evils that mortals can inflict on mortals. Indeed, one who refuses to be my companion in pain will not be my companion in joy; and one who now refuses to take part in my shame will not be a sharer in my glory.[7] Though this is shame among mortals, it is true glory with God. For I assure you of this: whoever proclaims my name here among mortals, a name that will be hated and cursed in the world, I in turn will proclaim him when the majesty of the Son of God is displayed before God's angels. Conversely, whoever does not acknowledge me here among mortals will not be acknowledged by us before God's angels.

'I know that the weakness of this body will be a stumbling block to many, but the guilt that comes from either human error or natural weakness will be easily forgiven, however terrible it may be. So the fact that they call me a Samaritan, a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors, and Jesus the carpenter's son will be easily forgiven if they repent.[8] For that is an insult to which the weakness of this body has given rise. But if anyone insults the Holy Spirit through whom God works these miracles, he will find no forgiveness in this world or the next, since with malice aforethought he knowingly and deliberately opposes the glory of God. No return to penitence is left for the godless angels, since they opposed God from no weakness but from stubborn wickedness; they will never repent, and they have no hope of forgiveness. Just so humans who imitate their perversity will be in the same situation.[9] They see me a human being, sleeping, feeling hunger; they will also see me dying. It is pardonable if they say against me what can apply to a human. But the fact that corrupted by envy they attribute to the spirit of Beelzebub the deeds that they know belong to the glory of God, both defrauding God of his glory and transferring what is God's to the godless demons – this is certainly the devil's wickedness, and it will get no forgiveness from God, inclined to pity though he is, for the very reason that such wickedness does not know how to repent.[10]

* * * * *

Avoiding an appearance of expressing the value of human life in commercial terms, the last sentence of the paraphrase on 12:7 replaces the Gospel text's 'you are of more value' with 'you are better' (*meliores*). Likewise Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 489B explains that 'of more value' means 'of greater merit, dignity, or esteem.'

7 Cf John 12:25–6 and the paraphrase on that passage CWE 46 153–4.

8 For the disparaging epithets cf John 8:48, Luke 7:34, Matt 13:55, and Mark 6:3.

9 For the fallen angels cf the paraphrase on 11:2.

10 This explanation, that the pardonable sins against the Son of Man in 12:10 arise from human weakness or error in perceiving Jesus as another fallible mortal,

'And so there will be many sorts of loud protests against your preaching. For some will persecute you out of honest error or out of error and wickedness combined. Some, in opposition to their own heart's awareness, will assail the plainly evident and recognized truth for no other reason than that it conflicts with their base passions. Through these people the wicked spirit of Satan will rebel against the good spirit of God, and through its henchmen it will attack you with every kind of device. But though you are uneducated, poor, and low-born, there is no reason for you to fear the uproar of the world against you. The spirit of God, kindly and forthright, is sufficient against all the deceit, all the violence of this world. So when you are dragged into their synagogues, accused of great crimes, when you are dragged before the magistrates and princes, do not do what the common run of defendants generally does, who are worried about what they should answer or what they should say so that they can get out of the case. You will grant this to the public authorities, that when you are summoned you will appear. But there is no reason for you to fear being in their presence or to be concerned to defend yourselves in a carefully rehearsed speech. The simple speech of truth will always be at hand. As often as you need it, the Holy Spirit will provide it for you. As your life is, so will your speech be.[11] Indeed, nothing is more effective than the simple truth.'

But as fear of the courtroom leads some astray from wholehearted proclamation of the gospel, so desire for money corrupts many. Hence, so

* * * * *

and that the unpardonable sin against the Holy Spirit is the attribution of his miraculous deeds to the power of the devil rather than the power of God, is formulated in terms most like Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 489B–490C. Similar views, particularly about the nature of the sin against the Holy Spirit, are found in Athanasius *Epistula 4 ad Serapionem de Spiritu Sancto* PG 28 649–76, Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1818C–D (though it is not Ambrose's preferred explanation), Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 41 (42) PG 57 448 (on Matt 25–32), the *Gloss* (on 12:10), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 881D–884A, and Hugh of St Cher (on 12:10) 207V (citing Chrysostom).

11 *Qualis est vita vestra, talis erit et oratio*; cf *Adagia* I vi 50: *Qualis vir, talis oratio* 'As the man is, so is his talk.' *Oratio* can be 'talk' in general, and in Christian times also 'prayer,' but it has important classical uses concerning formal oratory, especially that intended for the courtroom. In the annotation *qualiter aut quid respondeatis* (on 12:11) Erasmus explains that ἀπολογήσεσθε 'answer' in the Greek text implies answering an accuser in court; most ordinary defendants, he says, are neither familiar with legal formalities nor sufficiently instructed in the methods of refuting a charge. Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 884A–B observes that Jesus is relieving the fears that arise in the minds of uneducated countryfolk when they have a brush with the law.

that the Lord could remove from deep within the hearts of his disciples this passion too, as being something petty and unworthy of those who undertake the heavenly task, material presented itself through which that could happen. For although there was quite a thick crowd around Jesus, and no one till now had dared to ask such a mundane thing of him, someone said, 'Teacher, my brother is holding our joint inheritance, and he refuses to be pinned down and is putting off the division of the property. Give me the help of your authority in this. Tell him to divide the inheritance with me.'

But Jesus, as if displeased at being interrupted in his heavenly task for unspiritual and sordid cares, and at the same time teaching his followers that he who carries out the office of an apostle ought not be entangled in profane and sordid transactions, replied,[12] 'Fellow, with what brazenness do you interrupt me for a complaint against your brother about dividing an inheritance! Who appointed me judge between you, who are disagreeing about a trivial thing that will soon perish? Or who assigned me to you as an arbitrator of inheritances? Doesn't this world have judges to settle such petty lawsuits? I was not appointed so that this one or that one might be made richer by inheriting an estate, but so that everyone might come to inherit eternal life.'

Then turning to the disciples and the others who were there,[13] he began, using the example of the man who had interrupted him, to dissuade them from the pursuit of wealth – not that wealth is a bad thing in itself, but because it is folly to set wealth as the primary safeguard of one's life and to be called away from the things that concern eternal bliss by the pursuit of it. 'Be continually on guard,' he said, 'against everything that borders on greed, for often under pretext of need and prudence the gloomy vice creeps up, which once let in leads a person astray into every sort of disgrace.[14] And

* * * * *

12 Nicholas of Lyra (*moraliter* on 12:13) says, 'He shows that preachers of the gospel ought not involve themselves in deciding secular transactions.'

13 The Gospel text of verse 15 says merely 'He said *to them*.' Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 491C–D, however, remarks that Jesus' statement in verse 15 and the parable that follows are addressed to 'both the crowds and the disciples. 'This observation is repeated by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 12:15) and – citing Bede – Hugh of St Cher (on 12:15) 207v.

14 For the 'gloomy vice' (*triste vitium*) cf Juvenal *Satires* 14.109–10: 'The vice [of avarice] deceives with the ghost and likeness of virtue / since it is gloomy in manner and austere of face and dress.' The Christian poet Prudentius describes the warrior Avarice on the battlefield of the Virtues and Vices in similar terms: 'She becomes a Virtue in appearance, and austere of face and dress /

it can scarcely be avoided unless we possess lightly and disdainfully even the things that we possess in our own right. But those who trust in their wealth so as to place some considerable assurance of human happiness in it deceive themselves greatly. For plenty does not make for happiness but for worry, and for neglect of the things that ought to be sought for even apart from all else.[15] Nature's needs are in fact satisfied with little.'

To implant this more deeply in the dull-witted people,[16] the Lord added a comparison by which everyone might examine and test his own

* * * * *

the one they call Frugal, who delights in living cheaply' (*Psychomachia* 553–4). Prudentius goes on to describe the defeat of Avarice by Good Works (573–628).

15 That wealth is a source of anxiety is also suggested by Basil of Caesarea *Homilia in illud Lucae Destruam horrea mea* (on 12:18–21) PG 31 261A–264C, the *Gloss* (on 12:22), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 885C, Hugh of St Cher (on 12:18) 208r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 12:17).

16 The Gospel text of verse 16, like that of 15, says only 'he said *to them*'; cf n13 above. But Erasmus here takes the parable as a teaching tool for the people, who are presumably even slower to understand his meaning than the disciples; cf Matt 13:10–13, Luke 8:9–10, and the paraphrases on those passages LB VII 77E–78B and 361D–E.

In the *Paraphrases* Erasmus is fond of the adjective *crassus* 'thick,' 'dense,' 'fat,' 'crude,' 'dull,' 'stupid,' 'foolish.' In the Gospel *Paraphrases* the word most often describes persons who are unable, from ignorance or inexperience, to see beyond material or literal reality in actions and words to the spiritual truths they veil. So of the 'dull-witted people' here (*crasso populo*) and in the paraphrase on 13:6, and later of Herod, *crassus rex* 'thickheaded king' (on 23:11), the soldiers at the crucifixion, *crassum hominum genus* 'a thickheaded class of people' (on 23:36), and Jews in general, *ut crassis Iudaeis essent figurae rerum spiritualium* '[the Law was given] so that the thickheaded Jews would have figures of spiritual things' (on 24:27, 238 below). There is always at least a latent possibility that those described as *crassus* could learn to understand spiritual truth, in contrast to the Pharisees, scribes, and elders, to whom, in this volume, the word is rarely, if ever, applied. Note the words Erasmus puts in the mouth of the resurrected Jesus: 'These shadows of visible things are given for a time to an unschooled and thickheaded people so that in time they may advance through these first lessons to the things of the heart' (chapter 24, 241–2 below). In particular *crassus*, along with words meaning untutored, humble, ordinary, foolish, and ignorant, is applied to the disciples and others in descriptions of Jesus' efforts to teach and train them to follow him, eg on 17:6: *suos apostolos adhuc esse crassos et imperfectos* 'his apostles were still thickheaded and imperfect.' In the paraphrase on 22:38 the disciples still are in a *crassus affectus* 'dull-witted state,' and at 24:26 Jesus reproaches the two disciples walking to Emmaus, *vos adhuc adeo crassae mentis estis* 'are you

disposition. 'There was a rich man,' he said, 'whose fields had produced very abundant crops, even allowing for the variation in annual yields. [17] Yet he, never thinking about relieving his neighbours' poverty but just as if what had been produced had been produced for only one person, was worried about storing it, not about disbursing it.[18] For he said to himself, "What shall I do? The yield of grain is too great for my barns to be able to store the crop." If he had let himself be guided by love when he was in such mental turmoil, love would have said to him "Look around at how many are in need of what you have in excess. Acknowledge to whom you owe even your year's productivity. God has favoured you with capital from which you may garner the interest of heavenly deeds. Exchange transitory goods for permanent ones, earthly for heavenly, human for divine. Thus your generosity will have been your gain." But since he preferred to be guided by folly and thoughtlessness, at their urging he said to himself, "I will tear down my old barns and build bigger ones, and put all this year's yield, and the rest of my goods, in them, so nothing is lost. And then, when everything is well settled and put away, free of all care I will say to my soul, 'Soul, you have a large supply of things put by that will be enough for many years; relax, eat, drink, and enjoy yourself.'"[19]

* * * * *

still so thickheaded?' Cf the pedagogical flavour of the paraphrases on John 3:4–9 and 4:5–15 CWE 46 44–7 and 54–6, where the word, among others, is used with reference to Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman at the well. The Law itself, in so far as it contains rituals and ceremonies, which are figures through which the Jews have the opportunity to see glimmers of the spiritual reality beyond, is called 'carnal and crude' *carnale et crassum* (on 16:18). See also the Index of Greek and Latin words in other CWE volumes of the *Paraphrases*.

17 The aside that agricultural abundance varies has analogues in the interlinear *Gloss* (on 12:16), which notes that the abundance in verse 16 means 'more than usual,' and Nicholas of Lyra (on 12:16), who says 'much more than in the usual course of things.'

18 In this sentence Erasmus' *natum* for 'produced' and *erogare* for 'disbursing' echo the language of Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 491D; Bede's language is also echoed in the *Gloss* (on 12:16 and 17).

19 The Gospel text of the end of verse 19 in Latin says *comede, bibe, epulare* 'eat, drink, be merry' (RSV). But the verb *epulari* normally means 'to feast.' Valla in the annotation *requiesce, comede, bibe, epulare* (*Annot in Lucam* 12) remarked that since eating has already been mentioned, a word that means 'rejoice' more generally would be better here and in the account of the return of the prodigal son (15:23–4); he quotes in support Ps 104:15. In his annotation *epulare* (on 12:19) Erasmus repeats the content of Valla's note, including the quotations from Psalms and Luke 15. He concludes that *epulari* must mean not just to hold

'While the rich man was turning over in his mind this daydream of long-term happiness, suddenly the voice of God came to him, saying, "You fool, since life itself is not guaranteed you, why are you storing up for years to come? For only in this life can you enjoy the things you are putting away, and no one is guaranteed life for even a single day. Why are you promising yourself many years? This very night they will require your soul of you. And the things you have acquired – whose will they be? They certainly won't be yours. You will have to leave them to your heir, or to anyone else who seizes them. But spiritual riches, which you could have acquired by disbursing your wealth, would have accompanied you even in death." Here you have the example and situation of a man who stores up for himself the riches of this world and who is only rich for himself but not rich before God, for God desires that relief be provided among his members through those who are well-to-do. And those who become poor in this way are more blessedly rich.'[20]

When the Lord had said this to the general throng, he then turned to his disciples, who had not only to be far from all greed but also to be free from all worry about this life, lest anything detain their hearts from the business of the gospel.[21] 'That is why,' he said, 'I have told you just now, and I will repeat it and warn you again and again, do not be anxious about your body's life, worried that you might be without food or drink;[22] or again about your body's discomfort, that you might be without clothing.

* * * * *

a dinner party but *genialiter et opipare comesari* 'to revel merrily and lavishly.' Even so in the paraphrase here he prefers to replace *epulari* with *oblectari*, a word that means 'enjoy oneself' without any special connotation of feasting.

20 Erasmus' interpretive line here, that the rich man was a steward of God's bounty, obliged by his riches to help the poor and thus to earn spiritual wealth that would accompany him beyond death, is the standard one in the exegetical tradition. Cf eg the homily devoted to this passage by Basil of Caesarea *Homilia in illud Lucae Destruam horrea mea* (on 12:18–21) PG 31 261A–278C, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 733C–736B, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 491D–492B, and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 885C–889A; Bede is then echoed in the *Gloss* (on 12:16 and 17) and Nicholas of Lyra (on 12:17 and 18). Cf also Luke's parable of the unjust steward (16:1–8) and the paraphrase on it, below.

21 While the interlinear *Gloss* (on 12:22) and Hugh of St Cher (on 12:22) 208r explain that Jesus speaks to the disciples because he is inviting them in particular to disdain worldly concerns, there is no suggestion, as there is in Erasmus here, that the reason is their preaching mission. Nicholas of Lyra (*moraliter* on 12:22–3), however, explains Jesus' words as intended 'to remove from preachers of the gospel futile worries about the necessities of the present life.'

22 Drink is not actually mentioned in the Gospel text until verse 29.

Your heavenly Father, who has given you that which is more excellent, will also add that which is of less account.[23] The soul is more important than food, even though without food it does not stay long in the dwelling of the body; and the body is more precious than clothing. Or do you think that the Father, wealthy and kindly alike, when he has bestowed life, will allow the food by which life is prolonged to be lacking? Or that he who gave the body will permit the body to be without covering?[24]

'If the providence of God does not cease in the case of brute and worthless living creatures, will it cease in your case, whom he has chosen for so great a task? Consider the ravens: they do not sow or reap or have a storehouse[25] or a barn; and yet God sees to their food, neglecting not one of his creatures. How much more will the Father see to you, whom he holds so much dearer than the ravens?[26] What about the fact that being anxiously distressed by concern for such things is a mark not only of mistrust but also of folly? For it is foolish to be tormented with worry that will do no good. No one can make his life one day longer by worrying about it. What about the fact that not even the size or shape of your body is in your own control? God gives it the form he chooses and the size he chooses; in the same way he gives it life for as long as he chooses. And which of you can

* * * * *

23 The exegetical tradition makes explicit the inference that God, who gave what is greater without anxiousness on the part of the human recipients, will also provide the lesser necessities. Cf Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 737C (also cited in the *Catena aurea* on 12:23), Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.24, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 492C–D, Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 889C, Hugh of St Cher (on 12:23) 208v, and Nicholas of Lyra (*moraliter* on 12:22–3).

24 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 492C–D also says that *anima* 'soul' in verse 22 means the life force whose sustenance is corporeal food; the idea is echoed by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 12:22) and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 889C.

25 *penuarium.* In the annotation *quibus non est cellarium* (on 12:24) Erasmus cites Valla's annotation on the same passage, where Valla, commenting that *cellarium* usually means 'wine cellar,' suggests instead *penuarius* or *promptuarium* 'storehouse' and 'storeroom.' Valla adds that the Greek being translated is the same as what had been translated in 12:3 as *cubiculum* '(bed)chamber' (*Annot in Lucam* 12). Erasmus' annotation makes the same point about *cubiculum* but calls Valla's objections to *cellarium* quibbles. Nonetheless here he uses Valla's suggestion *penuarius* instead of *cellarium.*

26 The Latin of the Gospel text means 'you are worth so much more' (*quanto magis vos pluris estis*). Erasmus' annotation *pluris estis illis* (on 12:24) explains that the Greek verb διαφέρειν used here, while it does mean *differre* 'be different' as noted by Valla *Annot in Lucam* 12, is often used for *praestare* and *antecellere* 'stand out,' 'excel.' The paraphrase again clarifies the Vulgate expression and avoids the appearance of a sheerly commercial valuation. Cf n6 above.

add a single cubit to the height of his body by worrying about it? Or who can turn one hair of his head from white to black or from black to white by worrying about it?[27] So if your worrying does no good in the things that are of the least importance, what is the point of being worried about your life?

'Now lest you be anxious about clothing, just consider, please, the lilies, which come out in the meadows without human care, how they rise to their rightful size with no one tending them. They do not toil or spin or weave; and yet the Father's providence is so far from letting them go unclothed that Solomon the rich, even when he was loudly displaying his good fortune, was not clothed like a single one of the meadow flowers, short-lived though it is. But if God in such great providence clothes even the grass that grows everywhere and is soon to die, the grass that is green in the fields today but tomorrow withers and is thrown into the oven,[28] how much more will he not allow you to be naked, O you who trust too little?[29] For that worry comes from nowhere else than from lack of faith in the Father, who is supremely powerful and generous and provident. If he feeds and clothes and governs all that he has made, then you also are to give up worrying about insignificant things: food, drink, and clothing. Do not let a shortage of such things discourage you, or an abundance elate

* * * * *

27 The text of verse 25 in Latin says *cogitando* 'by thinking.' Erasmus' annotation *cogitando* (on 12:25) says that *sollicitudine* 'by worry' is a better translation of the Greek; he emphasizes worry and anxiousness in the paraphrase here. The allusion to the inability to change hair color by mental effort is paralleled by Matt 5:36, but the context there is different.

28 Here Erasmus replaces the *foenum* 'hay' of the Vulgate with *herba* 'grass.' His annotation *si autem foenum* (on 12:28) says the point of the comparison is that if God cares for green grass that dries out the same day it is cut, especially in hot regions, he will certainly not neglect us. Hugh of St Cher (on 12:28) 209r similarly adds 'green' to the verse's 'is in the field.'

29 *parum fidentes* 'who trust too little' is Erasmus' paraphrase on the Vulgate *vos pusillae fidei* 'you of little faith.' His annotation *quanto magis vos modicae fidei* (on 12:28) (which would replace *modicae* in the lemma with the more familiar *pusillae* in 1535) observes that the Greek word being translated means *parum fidentes*, the same phrase he uses here. 'For' he says 'there is *fides* of the one who pledges and *fides* of the one who trusts. For so we Christians apply [the word].' The allusion is to the notorious problem of using the Latin word *fides* and its cognates, marked by the stem *fid-*, for the NT Greek πίστις 'faith.' Erasmus would expatiate on the difficulties implicit in the *fid-* group of words in a 1527 annotation *ex fide in fidem* (on Rom 1:17); cf CWE 56 42–5, with references there to other discussions of the same problem.

you. And do not be gazing fixedly up at the sky, taking note of all the storm warnings, panicking every time the stars threaten shortage in the grain supply.[30]

'For it is the way of the gentiles, who are enthralled by the world and do not know God, to inquire about such things far into the future; but as for you who do know how kindly a Father you have in heaven, why torment your hearts with idle worrying? For your Father knows that you are in need of the things that concern the body's requirements for nourishment and clothing. And he is not so harsh as to allow you who are doing his work to perish for lack of them. Instead, let your first concern be the advancement of the kingdom of God, whose heralds and servants I have chosen you to be.[31] Before all else seek his righteousness, which is located not in Jewish ceremonies but in the things I have taught you earlier; and do so wholeheartedly, for that is most important of all.[32] God himself will add the other, less important things for you, and will not let you be in need of anything.

'Let nothing frighten you, little flock. You are few, you are lowly, you are ordinary folk, you are armed with neither wealth nor power nor weapons nor troops against this wicked world that will soon rise against you

* * * * *

30 The traditional Vulgate translation of the last phrase in verse 29, μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε, is *nolite in sublimi tolli* 'do not be elated,' which was understood by Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.29A to be an injunction against the pride that comes with material good fortune. Augustine was echoed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 493D–494A, the interlinear and marginal *Gloss* (on 12:29), and Hugh of St Cher (on 12:29) 209r. So Erasmus says in the preceding sentence 'Do not let ... an abundance elate you. But his annotation *in sublimi tolli* (on 12:29) argues that the Greek verb connotes nothing about swollen pride but rather that we should not be anxious about the things in the clouds and the upper reaches of the air; he proposes that the term refers to those who try to predict the future from the movements of the stars, a characteristic, he says, of rich men and princes. The paraphrase here follows this explanation.

31 Again Erasmus suggests that, in a passage specifically directed to the disciples, seeking the kingdom of God (verse 31) means for them their mission of going out into the world as successors to Jesus in his earthly career (cf the paraphrases on verses 7, 14, and 22, with nn6, 12, and 21 above). Cf the introduction to the paraphrase on the Lord's Prayer in chapter 11, especially on verse 1, and n5 in that chapter.

32 This sentence accommodates Erasmus' Vulgate text of verse 31, which adds to 'the kingdom of God' *et iustitiam eius* 'and his righteousness.' Yet in the annotation *et iustitiam eius* (on 12:31) he reports that these words do not appear in Greek or in older Latin manuscripts, but have been added here from Matthew 6 [6:33].

with every possible device. Yet you have nothing to fear. So it has pleased the Father, rejecting the powerful, the learned, and the arrogant, to give to you, who are in the world's view quite worthless, this kingdom, which with its secret wealth of hearts, its heavenly defences, is unconquered. Chosen, then, for the great honour of a heavenly kingdom, scorn these lowly things; destined for everlasting goods, disregard the ones that will soon perish.

'But if earthly possessions hold you back from things so much better, sell what you own and disburse the money thus made in relieving the needs of the poor. Riches cannot be invested more safely, or banked at greater or more reliable interest. Whoever gives charity lends money to God, who cannot default; and rich and kindly as he is, for cheap things he will return precious ones, for earthly things heavenly ones, for transient things soon to be taken away, eternal ones. So apply yourselves to growing rich in this wealth. Provide yourselves with purses that do not wear out; store up for yourselves treasure in heaven that will never fail, that will be kept safe for you from both thieves and worms. Indeed, we see it regularly happen that where each person has his treasure, there he has his heart also. For whatever anyone loves passionately he cannot forget. When a rich man, for instance, who has his wealth stored away or buried at home is busy elsewhere, his thoughts are still at home, worried that a thief might steal or some mischance disclose or damage his treasure.[33] Again, those who love always have their heart bent on the object of their love. But your heart ought to be always in heaven. And it will be always there if you have nothing on earth that you either admire or love but have all your treasure stored up in heaven.

'The time is short. You must act with all your energy to store up as many good deeds as possible in heaven. The day is at hand when each person will reap an eternal harvest in return for his sowing of temporal things.[34] Since the day is not known to you, you must be prepared and girded up for it at all times. And you will be if you are not held back by

* * * * *

33 The worry of a rich man, sketched here, is illustrated in detail by Euclio the miser in the *Aulularia* of Plautus; cf chapter 11 n26 above. Euclio's main concern is to conceal from his household and his neighbors the location of his pot of gold, which is buried near the hearth, and his greatest distress occurs when he suspects its whereabouts have been revealed while he was out of the house.

34 For 'the time is short' (*tempus breve est*) see 1 Cor 7:29. For 'the day is at hand' (*instat dies*) see eg 2 Thess 2:2. Reaping an eternal harvest from an earthly sowing is a familiar biblical figure, found eg in John 4:35–8, 2 Cor 9:6, Gal 6:7–9.

the baggage of worldly affairs, if you have not let pass any opportunity to do good. Then let your loins be girded for this day at all times, let the lamps be burning in your hands, so that you are like wise and faithful servants who, not knowing when their master will return from the wedding, are always girded up and standing with torches so that as soon as he comes back and knocks they can instantly open up for him. This diligence on the part of the servants will not be unpleasing to the master; rather, they will be blessed if the master finds them watching when he comes unexpectedly. For I assure you that the master will pay a very liberal wage in return for the duty that they owed in any case. He himself, in fact, will in turn gird himself and bid them take their places at table, and going back and forth and noting what each one asks for, he will serve them.

'And it doesn't matter at what time of night he comes (for he wanted it not to be fixed), but whenever he comes, whether in the second watch or the third watch, even at the dead of night, the servants will be blessed if the master finds them ready. So you must not shirk in this life; you must live as if that day were coming today. For it will creep up unawares. You must take care at all times that it does not fall upon you unprepared. Indeed, once that day has come it will be too late to mend your earlier drowsiness. No householder is so careless that he would let his house be broken into by a thief in the night if he knew when the thief was going to come. But if the householder keeps watch in order not to be robbed of his earthly goods, how much more must you keep careful watch in order not to lose eternal bliss? Just as a thief in the night creeps up at the very time when everyone is fast asleep and a burglar is least expected, so the Son of Man will come unexpectedly at the time when you least think he will. Since then the time is unknown to you but it is certain that it will come, be ready always, armed with good works, unburdened from all the baggage of worldly affairs.'[35]

When Peter heard these words, he said, 'Lord, do you mean that parable to apply to us in particular, or does it apply to everyone?' Now the Lord so directed his answer that he did not deny that it applied in some

* * * * *

35 This sentence summarizes and interprets the injunctions of verse 35 above. Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 108 PL 38 633, citing Matt 5:15–16, says that the burning lamps are our fervour in the performance of good works; Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 495B–C says that the girded loins refer to abstinence from love of worldly things and agrees with Augustine about the symbolism of the burning lamps. For detachment from everyday business see also the paraphrase on verse 59 below.

measure to everyone who desired eternal salvation but did indicate that it chiefly pertained to those to whom the stewardship of the gospel word was entrusted.[36] He added another parable also, to rouse his disciples even more to unending perseverance in their duty, setting out both the reward for those who carry out the duty and the penalty for the one who shirks it. 'It is a rare thing among humans,' he said, 'to find a wise and faithful steward of one's household affairs, who while the master is away on business cares for the master's household, which has been left in his charge, not so as to wield tyranny over it but so as to dispense each one's due from his master's resources, as much as is needed and when it is needed.[37]

'Blessed will the slave be who is found at his duty when his master comes home unexpectedly! In fact, having learned his trustworthiness and carefulness in the things assigned him, the master will put him in charge of all his goods, and will see fit to have him as it were a partner in all his affairs. Conversely, if that slave is not conscientious or wise, but, carried away by his master's absence and the responsibility delegated to him, says in his heart, "My master has now postponed his return for a long time, and perhaps he is never coming back; in the meantime I will suit myself," and begins to act violently towards his fellow slaves and the maidservants, not only not feeding them from the wheat of their common master but also

* * * * *

36 Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 748C–749A says, regarding the answer to Peter's question, that some of the Lord's injunctions speak to the less advanced in the faith and some to the more advanced, who hold the rank of teachers; in this case the parable in the following verses makes it clear that verses 32–40 apply to the teachers and other leaders, not to everyone. Other representatives of the exegetical tradition make less definitive divisions, allowing that in some sense verses 42–8 apply to all believers, who will be judged according to their individual capacities and works, though they do have special reference to pastors. Cf Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* 7 PL 15 1821C–1822A, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 497A–C, the interlinear and marginal *Gloss* (on 12:41–8), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 900B–C, Hugh of St Cher (on 12:41–4) 211r–v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 12:41–8). Most of these, having clergy as their primary audience, naturally emphasize the application to clergy.

37 Erasmus paraphrases Jesus' rhetorical question in verse 42 ('Who then is the faithful and wise steward ...?') as an affirmative statement. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 497D observes that the implied answer is that such people are rare; Jesus, he says, is indicating the difficulty, not the impossibility, of attaining perfect virtue.

In the annotation *tritici mensuram* (on 12:42) Erasmus says that the 'measure of wheat' can mean 'portion of food of all kinds'; cf the RSV 'portion of food.' The paraphrase uses an even more general expression, *cuique suum* 'each one's due.'

striking and beating them and exercising a kind of tyranny, while he himself eats and drinks, stuffs himself and gets drunk, wasting his master's goods in foul pleasures and debauchery – what do you think will happen to such a steward? Of course the master will come back on a day when he was not expected, and at a time that was not known; and that servant unconcernedly doing whatever he pleased he will separate and cut off from his household, and will not think him deserving of accommodation in his house but will count him among the rest of the unfaithful, to pay the penalty because he was unwilling to be mindful of his duty.[38]

'The steward of the gospel can win his master's good will by nothing more than by the ready display to a neighbour of his absent master's generosity, and by not imagining himself the master but remembering he is a slave like other slaves. Indeed, the more complete his knowledge of the gospel truth, the more severe will be his condemnation if he neglects to follow what he has learned is right. For gentiles to whom the truth was proclaimed by neither the Law nor the gospel will be more lightly punished than the Jews, whom the Law has trained to some degree of progress in godliness. And again, among the Jews the Pharisees and lawyers will be punished more severely than the common people. But the heaviest penalties of all will be paid by those whom knowledge of the gospel truth and so many miracles and my example did not rouse to desire for true godliness.

'I have hidden nothing from you. Whatever the heavenly Father wanted you to know through me I have shared with you.[39] So beware of the example of the negligent slave. For the slave whom the master considered outstanding above the others, to whom he entrusted the stewardship of his property, with whom he shared his secret intentions, on whom he relied when he went away on business – if that slave does not do what he was ordered and prepare himself to carry out what he knew in his heart his master wanted, he will get a severe beating. But if some one of the common crew of slaves, not one to whom the master made known his heart's purpose, does something deserving of punishment, he will get a light beating.

* * * * *

38 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 498D explains that Jesus' words in verse 46, 'will cut him in pieces and put him with the unfaithful,' do not mean literally to cut with a sword but to separate from association with the faithful (RSV translates 'will punish him and put him with the unfaithful,' but notes 'will cut him in pieces' as an alternative to 'will punish him'). He is followed by the *Gloss* (on 12:46), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 901C, and Hugh of St Cher (on 12:46) 211V.

39 Possibly an allusion to 12:2 above and its parallels at Matt 10:26 and Mark 4:22. Cf also John 17:6–8.

So there is no reason why the stewardship of the gospel word[40] entrusted to you should make you more arrogant; rather, it should make you more anxious. Whoever undertakes an ecclesiastical office undertakes a burden more truly than an honour. What is entrusted to him is unearned, and it is entrusted for the purpose of being brought out for the common good of the entire household. As masters require a more exact accounting from the one to whom they have entrusted more, so from the one to whom a more bountiful gift of knowledge and authority has been given by God more will be asked than from others; and one to whose faithfulness a broader and greater office has been committed will have more required of him inasmuch as he was obliged to benefit more people. The more learned you are, the more willingly shall you teach; the richer you are, the more willingly shall you assist the poor; the more powerful you are, the more people shall your authority draw to the gospel. What you have belongs to another; its master[41] wishes what he has entrusted to you to be disbursed.

'I thirst for the salvation of humankind, and for its sake I came into the world; and every delay is already too long for my desire.[42] It is not a dilute or human teaching that I have brought from the heavens. It is pure fire that will either cleanse or consume a person.[43] And that is why I came, so that this fire can be kindled on earth. Indeed, what else do I desire? Once kindled it will sweep up the whole world far and wide in its flames. But unless the flint of my body is struck on the cross the fire will not spring up. Still waiting is the baptism that the Father laid down for me, that I will be dipped in my own blood and pay the penalty with my own death for the sins of the whole world. And then at last there will flash out among humankind the spark of gospel love, when they see that an innocent man, of

* * * * *

40 *evangelicus sermo*. For the importance of *sermo* to Erasmus' theological thought, see the references in the Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited.

41 *dominus*. Erasmus is exploiting here, as he has throughout the paraphrase on 42–8, the interplay between the classical Roman meaning of *dominus*, 'master,' 'owner' of property of all kinds and its post-classical application to social superiors and to the Christian Lord. See the references in the Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited.

42 Cf Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 905B, who paraphrases, 'I thirst for the death on behalf of [ie that will make possible] the salvation of all people.' Cf also chapter 24 nn112–13 below.

43 The twin functions of fire, to cleanse what is precious and to consume what is worthless, are a common pair in Scripture; cf eg 1 Cor 3:12–13. The pair is mentioned in discussion of this passage by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1822A, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 753A–C (also in the *Catena aurea* on 12:49), and Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 499C–D.

his own free will, has endured a shameful death for the sake of the guilty. For this is the spark of perfect love. And not only do I not shrink from this baptism, but out of love for human salvation I am in great distress that it be completed as soon as possible. The body's nature shrinks from it, but the heart's love longs for it.[44]

'But this fire once kindled will arouse great uproars in the world. For it will be a raging celestial fire, shaking out and scattering all human passions. Or do you think that I came to bring to the earth the peace that this world loves, a world that finds tranquillity when the lusts of its heart are satisfied and evil men are in harmony with one another? Indeed not; I did not come to cement such accords but to let loose conflict.[45] Not everyone will be obedient to the gospel, and for the gospel's sake all things are to be despised. So it will happen that in the same house where there had earlier been an evil peace a salutary discord will arise.[46] Indeed, five who are naturally most closely tied will be divided among themselves for my sake, three against two, and again two against three. For what is more closely tied than a son to a father? Yet because of the gospel the father will quarrel with his son; and for the gospel's sake the son will despise his father. Likewise a mother will be at odds with her daughter, but gospel love will carry more weight with the daughter than parental affection. Also a mother-in-law will start a war with her daughter-in-law, but as for the daughter-in-law, love for eternal salvation will outweigh the ties of flesh.[47] For the bonds of the Spirit press more tightly than the bonds of nature.'

* * * * *

44 Cf 1 John 4:18, where 'perfect love casts out fear,' an appropriate theme for this paragraph. The baptism of verse 50 is identified as the baptism of Jesus in his own blood by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 499D, followed by the marginal and interlinear *Gloss* (on 12:50), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 905A–B, Hugh of St Cher (on 12:50) 212r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 12:49). Cf also the paraphrase on John 19:34 CWE 46 214. The closing sentence of the paragraph alludes to Erasmus' belief in the subjection of Jesus' human nature to terror in the face of death, as described eg at 22:41–4; see the paraphrase and notes below, especially chapter 22 n47. Cf the same point in Nicholas of Lyra (on 12:50).

45 For the contrast between the world's peace and the peace of Christ, cf John 14:27.

46 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 500B says, 'A good war was sent to shatter an evil peace.'

47 In the annotation *et duo in tres dividentur* (on 12:52) Erasmus says that the verb *dividi* 'be divided' in this passage means *habere dissidium* 'be at odds.' In the paraphrase on verses 52 and 53 he accordingly substitutes *dissidium habere* as well as *simultatem exercere* 'quarrel,' *contemnere* 'despise,' and *bellum suscipere* 'start a war' for the various appearances of *dividi* in the Gospel text. Bede

After this Jesus turned to the crowds and said, 'Then why are you not preparing your hearts for the kingdom of God, since it is at hand? Or don't you realize its closeness from all the signs in things? Why are you so poor at drawing conclusions in this when you draw conclusions so shrewdly in matters of much less importance? For when you see a cloud coming up in the west, you promptly predict that there will be rain, and what you predict happens. And again, when you feel the south wind blowing, you promptly predict that there will be a heat wave, and your forecast does not disappoint you. Yet it makes little difference whether it rains or not; but it makes all the difference that you attain everlasting salvation through the gospel faith.

'You hypocrites, how counterfeit are all your doings! Your wisdom is just like your sanctimony. In the things of this life you are wise; in eternal matters you see nothing. You observe the appearance of sky and land and from them you deduce forecasts of future events. Yet how is it that you do not notice from the appearance of so many signs that the time is near that brings salvation to all if it is accepted or eternal destruction if it is neglected? You know what the prophets promised, you see and hear so many things that are being said and done among you, you see that the world is being renewed, and do you still not conclude on your own that the promised time is at hand?[48] This alone is what you ought to have done with all zeal, and no material thing should be so valuable to you that for its sake you take the loss of your gospel profits.

* * * * *

In Lucam expos PL 92 500C–501B, who defines the symbolism of each of the family members, Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 908A–B, and Hugh of St Cher (on 12:53) 212v make it clear that the generational distinctions are also symbolic: the younger generation represents various parts of the Christian community asserting itself over the old ways and the old teaching. Erasmus also points to the Christian triumph of young over old.

48 The exegetical tradition agrees that the words of the prophets and Jesus' own deeds should have served as material for his contemporaries to reach the right conclusion regarding him and his message; cf Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 757C–760B (also in the *Catena aurea* on 12:54), Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 501B–D, followed by the interlinear and marginal *Gloss* (on 12:56), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 909A–B; and Nicholas of Lyra (on 12:56). Bede and his followers, the *Gloss* and Nicholas, give an important role to the rational faculty of humankind as a resource, a fact that may have influenced Erasmus' stress in these two paragraphs on drawing conclusions. Cf the paraphrases on 11:20 with n35 above and on 24:27, a vast expansion on the themes of prophecy and observation.

'If a piece of property holds you back, sell it; if someone causes you harm, forgive him rather than pursuing your right at law.[49] But if the matter has gone so far that you are on your way to the judge, make an effort, even on the way, to be released by your opponent. It is better to end the suit between you on unfair terms than to test the uncertain outcome of the courts, where the winning case is not always the better one. Otherwise you put yourself in danger of the judge's handing you over to the collections officer, and the officer's throwing you into prison.[50] If that happens, I assure you, you will not get out of there until you have paid back the amount sought to the last penny. Going to court is a troublesome business, and one who is hurrying towards the goal of gospel perfection has no time to linger over these everyday matters. So first weigh how much more profit there is in pardoning a wrong than in prosecuting it, how much more in not defending a case than in claiming your right to it. First, you gain the friendship, which is at risk if you start a lawsuit; then you save time, not a little of which was going to be wasted on the case. In addition you gain peace of mind, which lawsuits usually take away. Finally, you avoid whatever troubles an unfavourable outcome of the case can bring.'

Chapter 13

While Jesus was saying these and many other things to the general throng, inviting them with rewards to the service of godliness, frightening them with punishments, and leaving no stone unturned[1] to kindle the hearts of his listeners to eagerness for a better life, some men opportunely arrived to announce a horrible piece of news, about Galilean malefactors whom

* * * * *

49 For possessions as a hindrance to the spiritual life, cf 12:33 and 18:22; for grievances with others, cf Matt 18:21–2, 1 Cor 6:1–4.

50 Verse 58 mentions three government officials, the magistrate, the judge, and the collections officer. The parallel passage, Matt 5:25, names only the latter two. In the annotation *trahat te ad iudicem* (on 12:58) Erasmus remarks that 'the judge appears to be no other than the one called a magistrate just before, for settling with one's adversary on the way implies that you don't need to go to the judge.' Accordingly, while reference to a magistrate is gone from the paraphrase, 'the judges' appear in the sentence that paraphrases the opening of verse 58. Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 909C–D also omits any mention of the magistrate.

1 *Adagia* I iv 30 is *Omnem movere lapidem* 'To move every stone' (in CWE 31 340–1 rendered as 'To leave no stone unturned'); here Erasmus uses a Latin version, *nullum non movens lapidem*, in the form more familiar in English.

Pilate the governor had punished in a new way, by mixing the blood of the criminals with the blood of the cattle that they were sacrificing according to Jewish practice. Since what they had done was extraordinary they were chastised with a horrible punishment in order to frighten everyone else. Now the common run of humanity usually curses those so penalized, and congratulates itself for not having done such a thing, though often the self-congratulator is more criminally wicked than those whose open wrongdoing has been expiated by their public punishment.

Jesus wanted the deterrent force of this instance, which they thought applied only to those who had committed the same crimes, to extend to everyone. So he replied to them, 'Do you think that among all the Galileans these Galileans alone were wicked, because judicial severity wrought its violence against them alone? It is not enough for you not to do the wrongs they did; you must repent of all your sins. If you do not do this, although God's gentleness puts up with you for the present so that you can be converted, in the end you will all perish by a like punishment from God.[2]

'And do not let the deferral of vengeance create in you hope of escape from punishment. If you do not repent[3] in good time, it will come upon

* * * * *

2 Traditional exegesis regarded these Galileans as followers of the Judas of Galilee mentioned in Acts 5:37. He has been thought to be the Judas described by Josephus *Jewish Antiquities* 18.1.1–6, the leader of a movement punished by the Romans for allegedly fomenting treason and sedition; cf Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 760D–761C (also in the *Catena aurea* on 13:1; he cites Josephus by name) and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 912A–B. Hugh of St Cher (on 13:1–2) 213v tells a slightly different story, which he also attributes to Josephus; this may be a confused allusion to *Jewish Antiquities* 18.4.7. Nicholas of Lyra (on 13:1) gives both Cyril's explanation of the Galileans' crime and the association with Acts 5 (attributing it to Cyril), and the explanation of a *scholastica historia* about a magician from Galilee who was overtaken by Pilate as he was about to ascend to heaven from Mt Gerizim. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 502B–C, closely followed by the *Gloss* (on 13:1–3) offers no explanation of the Galileans' crime; he emphasizes that their wicked way of life harmed them, not their dying, and that their horrible deaths at least served as a warning to the living. By not naming the crime, though he calls it extraordinary, and by emphasizing the exemplary function of these deaths (and those at Siloam in verses 4–5) and the call to repentance, Erasmus seems to lean more towards the moralizing than the historiographical side of the tradition; he drops overt interpretation of these reports as foreshadowing the fall of Jerusalem to Titus in 70 AD, though it is found in all the sources just named. He will touch on that theme in the paraphrase on verse 9; see n6 below.

3 *resipiscere* here and below. See chapter 11 n46.

you suddenly and crush you as those eighteen were recently crushed by the collapsing tower in Siloam. Though you may escape human vengeance, God's punishment cannot in any way be avoided. The example of a few applies to you all. Or do you think that because the collapsing tower crushed those men, there have not been in Jerusalem many even more wicked than they? But God's mercy lets them off for now in hope of their penitence. The crimes of some are openly known, of others are hidden; and each one makes pets of his own evil deeds. But no one among you is good, and no one's evil will go unpunished. In fact, I assure you that unless you repent of your former sins, divine vengeance will in like manner crush you all. So see to it that you do not misuse God's gentleness by sinning more freely; remember that the later vengeance comes the more harshly will it come. God makes the call to penitence in many ways, now coaxing and now terrifying. In the end, when he sees that the stubborn wickedness of individuals cannot be corrected by any means, he destroys a person completely, once and for all, so that the one who refused to be good for his own sake may be a useful example to others.'

So that Jesus could implant this thought more deeply in the minds of the dull-witted crowd, he added a parable fitted to the subject. 'A certain man,' he said, 'had a tree, a fig, planted in his vineyard. In due course the man who had planted it came to it looking for the fruit that was long since promised by its fine crop of leaves; but leaves were all he found. So he sent for the tenant farmer of his vineyard and said, "Look, the third year has now gone by that I have come to this fig looking for fruit from it, and I don't find any. So cut it down. Why is it still taking up ground,[4] harming the vine with its shade and drawing to itself the moisture that could be nourishing the bearing trees?" But the farmer replied to his master, "Sir, you have put up with it for three years; let it be this year yet, till I try a last cure. For perhaps it is barren from a deficiency in the soil. So I will dig around it and apply manure to it. If it is roused by this treatment and bears fruit, you have saved the tree; but if you see that it is hopelessly barren, you will reach the last stage[5] and cut it down, so at least it won't harm

* * * * *

4 Although the paraphrase maintains the Vulgate *etiam* 'still,' 'also,' 'even now' in this sentence, Erasmus had said in the annotation *terram occupat* (on 13:7) that he would have preferred the word *vel* 'even' so that we would understand that the barren tree was undeserving not only of fertilizing and cultivation but even of the ground it took up. Here he does explicate what taking up the ground implies.

5 *venies ad id quod supremum est*; Erasmus borrows a rare expression from Virgil

your vineyard."' In this parable the Lord was certainly warning everyone in general not to disregard God when he called them to penitence. But he was especially censuring the Jewish people, who though so often called to better things by the patriarchs, by Moses and the Law, by the prophets, by John, and finally by so many miracles and the preaching of the gospel, nonetheless, because they persisted in stubborn wickedness, would have to be cut down at the root by the Romans.[6]

And just at this point there was an instance of a barren fig, so that the very situation put before their eyes what the image of the parable had outlined.[7] Observance of the ceremonies of the Law was so to speak the leaves of the synagogue, which appeared to promise a very sweet fruit and one most pleasing to God, that of true godliness and love towards one's neighbour – but the synagogue not only produced nothing of the kind but even bore the bitter fruits of jealousy, hatred, envious criticism, blasphemy, murder. For when Jesus in his customary way was teaching on the sabbath, there was a woman in the synagogue who had dealt with an incurable and wretched disease for eighteen years. Her body was so drawn together that she was unable to raise her head or look up.[8] Now here was material

* * * * *

Aeneid 12.803, where Jupiter, declaring that Juno must end her hostility to the settlement of Trojans in Italy, says *ventum ad supremum est* 'we have reached the last stage.'

6 Cf 3:9, 'the axe is laid to the root of the trees,' a passage cited in discussion of this episode by Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 761D–764D. Cyril lists the earlier calls to repentance as those of Moses and Aaron, Joshua and the judges of Israel, and all the prophets down to and including John the Baptist. Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 913A–916C has an abbreviated list. The fig is generally understood to mean the Jews: Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1830B–1834A, Cyril, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 503C–D and 505A, the *Gloss* (on 13:6–7 and 13:11), Theophylact, Hugh of St Cher (on 13:6–9) 213V, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 13:4–7); of these, all except Cyril and Hugh explicitly refer to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. All except Cyril and Nicholas also observe that while the fig specifically symbolizes the Jews, in more general terms it symbolizes 'us' or the whole human race, an interpretation also given by Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 90 PL 38 638–9.

7 Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1834B, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 505A, the *Gloss* (on 13:11), Hugh of St Cher (on 13:10) 214V–215R, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 13:11) also connect the parable of the barren fig with the miracle of the bent-over woman by calling the miracle and its aftermath an illustration of the parable.

8 In the annotation *inclinata* (on 13:11) Erasmus states his preference for *deflexa ... et contracta* over the Vulgate's *inclinata* to translate the description of the woman in Greek because she is completely bent down, not merely bowed. He

for putting forth good fruit, if the fig had not been completely barren. This woman represented the gentiles and those who, openly godless and wicked, paraded their misfortune before them, entirely bent on earthly things, not even thinking about eternal and heavenly matters. On the other hand, the Jew stood upright in the vineyard of the Lord (that is, in the synagogue), adorned with the words of the Law and physical ceremonies as with leaves, though he did not know how to do anything but to envy and slander.

The Lord, then, first looked at the woman with those most merciful eyes of his. This very act is already a forecast of the healing that is to come. And not content with this, of his own accord he called her to him. Blessed is anyone whom Jesus calls to himself, and blessed is the one who heeds his call! The woman came, full of good hope. The disease was long-standing and intractable, but no ungodliness or iniquity is so great that it cannot be taken away by faith in the gospel. So let us see the fruit of the good tree that Jesus found missing in the synagogue. 'Woman,' he said, 'you are freed from your infirmity.' He did not think her unworthy of the touch of his sacred body: he laid his hands on her, and immediately she was made straight, and acknowledging the kindness of heaven she glorified God.[9] Just so the church of the gentiles was suddenly altered, and abandoning its idols, its pursuit of money, its lusts most foul, to all of which it had long been so bound that it could not aspire to knowledge of heavenly matters, it began to praise the divine mercy by whose unearned favour it had been freed at a single stroke from all its sins, in bondage to which it had been Satan's wretched slave.[10]

* * * * *

adds that the Vulgate *sursum aspicere* 'look up' is inexact because the Greek ἀνακῦψαι describes instead the necessary preceding movement 'raise her head,' with no specific mention made of her ability to look in any direction. The paraphrase here substitutes *contracto corpore* 'her body ... drawn together' but accommodates both Erasmus' improved translation of the Greek and the familiar Vulgate by continuing, 'she was unable to raise her head or look up' (*non posset erigere caput nec adspicere sursum*).

9 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 505B marks out the same four stages of the woman's healing as Erasmus does here, looking, calling, touching, and straightening: 'He looked, in predestining her by grace; he called, in illuminating her by teaching; he laid hands on her, in helping her with spiritual gifts; he straightened her to glorify God, in advancing her to a sure end by good works.'

10 Allegorical interpretation of the woman as representing the gentiles is probably not surprising. It may strike a modern reader as more peculiar to restate the allegory proleptically, as Erasmus does here, as the 'church' of the gentiles before there is a church. Yet while in the passages cited in n7 above Ambrose says that the woman is a figure of the church after its eventual achievement

Now on the other hand consider with me the bad fruit of a bad tree. When the president of the synagogue saw this, barren fig that he was, and advertising himself to people's eyes only by the leaves of the Law, he was offended that Jesus had healed the woman on the sabbath. So he turned to the assembly as if about to instruct them in some great matter. Now listen to a truly pharisaic remark, and from it evaluate their entire teaching. The pious man, fearing that from Jesus' example the people would slide into impiety, took thought for their welfare, saying with great authority, 'There are six days on which it is lawful to do work. So if anyone wants to be healed, let him come on those days. But it is unlawful to break the sabbath.'

Our most merciful Lord did not put up with such a stupid remark as this, for he had not established the sabbath to provide a rest from helping one's neighbour, but so that there would be unbroken repose from evil deeds, a repose which those sabbath rests symbolized.[11] Furthermore, since this remark of the president's was advanced in accordance with the views of all the Pharisees, scribes, and lawyers, through the one he replied to them all, saying, 'You hypocrites, who disregard the intent of the Law and insist only on its surface, and who parade before yourselves the appearance of righteousness though you are far from true godliness, see what unjust judges you are here!

'Who of you is there whom respect for the sabbath prevents from untying his ox or his donkey from the stall to water him? If you judge that the sabbath is not broken on account of a good deed done for a dumb animal, are you throwing it up to me as a horrendous crime that I healed this true daughter of Abraham, who surely reflects her parent in the simplicity of her faith, on the sabbath?[12] Is your private convenience so valuable to you that you do not scruple to loosen your donkey's lead so he does not

* * * * *

of eternal rest, and Hugh of St Cher speaks of straightening the woman as a symbol of the establishment of the church, Bede, echoed by the *Gloss*, says that the woman represents the *ecclesiae primitivae sanatio* 'the healing of the primitive church,' which also seems to imply the existence of a church before the resurrection. Cf the paraphrase on 22:8–13, 186–8 below

11 The sabbath rest enjoined by the law of Moses is explained as a rest from evil deeds, not from the blessed duties of religious fervour, which will still be performed when sabbaths are celebrated in heaven, by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1834C–D, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 505C, and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 917D.

12 Cf John 8:39–44 and the paraphrase there CWE 46 115–17 on the reflection of the parent in the child.

die of thirst on the sabbath, yet you are offended because on the sabbath I have loosed this woman of your people, whom Satan held tied fast for eighteen years? If work is forbidden on the sabbath, who does more work, the one who unties his donkey and leads him to water, or I, who with just a word and a touch have healed the whole woman? Are you thus gentler to an ox or a donkey than to a sister or brother? And is that how you keep the Law – so that out of superstitious regard for it you neglect what is the chief point of the whole Law?'[13]

Since these words of Jesus contained truth perfectly evident and also consonant[14] with the general feeling of human nature, he struck shame into those detractors. For they were pained that some of their glory in the eyes of the multitude was decreasing, before whom they had till then advertised themselves.[15]

But Jesus wanted to make clear that all the Pharisees' empty showing off, with its grand display of sanctimony, would soon vanish, and that on the other hand the power of the gospel would advance from the humblest beginnings to such breadth that it would draw the whole world to itself – and all of that through death and through humble and uneducated apostles.[16] He put before them two parables to the same effect. 'You see,' he said, 'that the kingdom of the synagogue is fighting with the kingdom of God. But the one that is more powerful will win.' And so as if inspired by a fresh spirit, to make the crowd more attentive, the Lord said, 'What thing shall I say the kingdom of God is like, or to what shall I compare it, so that

* * * * *

13 On the contrast, a common one, between the Pharisees' observance of the Law and their misunderstanding of its spirit, cf for instance John 7:19–24 and the paraphrase on John 7:19 CWE 46 95. Like Erasmus here, Cyril elaborates the rhetorical questions of 13:15–16 to draw out their logical inconsistencies, including especially the comparison between manual labor as in watering one's animals and the act of healing merely by a word (Erasmus adds the 'touch' from verse 13); cf *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 768D–769B (also in the *Catena aurea* on 13:14–16).

14 The lifetime editions read for 'consonant' *consentaneum,* which grammatically should modify *sensum* 'general feeling'; LB prints *consentaneam,* modifying *veritatem* 'truth,' and the translation here follows that reading.

15 Erasmus omits the second half of verse 17, the people's reaction.

16 Erasmus here implies what he will suggest again at the end of the second parable, ie that the kingdom of God is the preaching of the gospel. Though most of the exegetical tradition understands the kingdom of God to be faith, Cyril *Catena aurea* on 13:19 says that it is the gospel, and Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 506C says that 'the kingdom is the preaching of the gospel and the knowledge of Scripture.'

you may understand what its nature is from something quite well known to each of you?'

And though now everyone was expecting some grand comparison taken from the sun or the lightning, he preferred to draw his parable from the most despised of seeds. He said, 'It is like a grain of mustard, which as long as it is intact is as worthless as it is tiny, pleasant to the eye in neither appearance nor odor; and whatever life force it has, it keeps within itself.[17] A certain prudent man when he got one did not despise it but sowed it in his garden. That most contemptible seed sprouted, and it grew into a huge tree, so that birds even nested in its branches[18] – the seed producing many thousands in place of the one little grain. Likewise the kingdom of God will spread itself most broadly when it most seems dead.

'And again, what thing shall I say the kingdom of God is like? It is like a tiny bit of yeast, which a prudent woman hid in three measures[19] of moistened flour, and left there, buried, as it were, until gradually the power of the yeast worked in all that dough, as much as it was. In the same way the humble teaching of the gospel will someday take over all the nations of the world.'

* * * * *

17 The physical qualities of the intact mustard seed, or their absence, are based on the evangelists' comments; cf Matt 13:32, Mark 4:31, and (not a mustard seed) John 12:24. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1835D–1836B, followed by the *Gloss* (on 13:19) and Hugh of St Cher (on 13:18–19) 215I, elaborates its worthlessness and observes that when it is ground it releases its pungency or heat as an odor; the heat (though not the grinding) is also mentioned by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 506C. These comments apparently underlie Erasmus' paraphrase here. Cf also the paraphrase on 17:6 below.

18 Here Erasmus uses *serere* 'sow' where the Vulgate has *mittere* 'send,' 'release,' 'cast,' 'let go'; the Vulgate Matt 13:31 and Mark 4:31–2 use *seminare* 'sow.' He uses *nidulari* 'nest' for the Vulgate's *requiescere* 'rest.' The annotation *requieverunt* (on 13:19) pointed out that the Latin translator sometimes uses *requiescere*, sometimes *nidificare* 'make a nest,' and sometimes *habitare* 'dwell' for the one Greek verb found here and elsewhere in Scripture. (Eg *habitare* appears at Matt 13:32 and Mark 4:32; *nidificare* at Ps 104:17, Jer 22:23 and 48:28.) *Nidulari* and *nidificare* are used in classical Latin apparently interchangeably. For both the sowing and the nesting Erasmus prefers the more precise and vivid terms to the more general and relatively colorless language of the Vulgate Luke.

19 The paraphrase substitutes *tribus mensuris* for the Gospel text's *sata tria*, which is also the term in Matt 13:33. The annotation *sata tria* (on 13:21) reminded its reader that Erasmus had already noted on Matt 13:33 that *satum* was not Latin but a Syrian measure equal to one and a half Roman *modii* (about thirteen litres or three and a quarter gallons). The same information is given by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 507C, followed by the *Gloss* (on 13:21).

So saying Jesus hastened towards the place where the grain of mustard was to be planted in the earth, where the yeast was to be hidden in the flour.[20] For he was journeying to Jerusalem, where he knew he was to be killed. Yet as he went through the various cities and villages he taught everyone, lest any opportunity for the gospel be wasted.

Now since he had taught some elevated things about selling one's property, about living from day to day like ravens and lilies, and about not striving with one's opponent, someone came up to him and said, 'Lord, are there only a few who attain salvation?[21] For I scarcely think many will embrace those teachings of yours. Yet on the other hand the parable of the mustard seed and the yeast seems to promise the opposite, that is, that the power of God's kingdom will come to many.'

Now Jesus wanted to show that report and knowledge of the gospel teaching, and the performance of miracles as well, would indeed come to very many people, but that no one would be saved who did not lay aside all the lusts of this world and follow the humble Christ. So he said, 'Strive to enter by the narrow gate. The slothful do not obtain entry. You must make an effort; the entryway is narrow but it leads to the breadth of the kingdom of heaven.[22] This gate does not take those laden with wealth, heaped with honours, distended with debauchery, heavy with greed, swollen and elated with pride. Such people choose the broad path, roomy and at first sight

* * * * *

20 Here Erasmus suggests that the mustard seed and the yeast symbolize Jesus himself, interpretations already cited by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1837A and 1838D, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 507B, echoed by the *Gloss* (on 13:18–21), and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 920B–D, though the same commentators offer (and sometimes prefer) other interpretations.

21 Selling one's property, living like ravens and lilies, and not striving with one's opponent are all in chapter 12, verses 33–4, 22–31, 58–9 respectively. 'Are there only a few,' *an pauci sunt* in the paraphrase, replaces *si pauci sunt* in the Vulgate. The annotation *si pauci sunt qui salvantur* (on 13:23) pointed out that *si* is used only to mean 'if' and not also to indicate a question, though εἰ, the Greek word it translates, can do either task; Erasmus would have preferred the Latin word *an*, which can have an interrogative sense. Here he makes that change.

22 *angustus est ingressus, sed ducit ad latitudinem regni coelorum* is perhaps a verbal reminiscence of a quotation attributed to Chrysostom's Homily 24 on Matthew by the *Catena aurea* on 13:22–30: *Si etiam via salutis angusta erit in introitu, tamen per eam pervenitur ad latitudinem* 'even if the way to salvation is narrow on entering, still through it do we reach breadth.' Nothing quite like this can be found in the text of Chrysostom's homily in PG 57 314–15, though it could be a summary of material there.

attractive but leading to death.[23] Strive, therefore, to enter now, while the way is open; shake off all your burdens so that the narrow entry can take you.[24] For I assure you of this: Someday there will be many who will desire to enter and will not be permitted to do so, for by then the way will be shut.

'For when the householder has entered and shut the door, which is now open to all those who press on, then repenting too late you will realize your mistake, and in envy of those who have entered you will begin to storm the entrance and pound at the door, saying, "Lord, open to us." Then he who earlier was not heeded when he invited you to enter will in his turn not listen to you, but will reply in this way: "I hear the name 'Lord,' but I do not recognize you as servants of my house; seek him whose slaves you are." Then you will start saying, "How does it happen, Lord, that now you do not recognize us? You were born among us, we ate and drank with you, and you have taught in our squares. And we are your disciples, and have even healed the sick and cast out demons in your name."

'To this the householder will reply, "The things you mention do not make my true disciples. I will recognize as mine the one who has followed in my footsteps. Whence you come I do not know. Depart from me; nothing will do you any good – not knowing the Law or having heard me teach, not family relationship or friendly association, not miracles done in my name. Whoever envies or hates his brother, whoever thinks only of his own glory with offence to the glory of God, whoever puts money before love of his neighbour, this person, whatever race he comes from, is none of mine. So depart; you will get a reward worthy of you from him whom you have worshipped. Since the servants of my house have suffered with me and for my sake, they will enjoy the delights of the eternal banquet with me."[25]

* * * * *

23 Like Erasmus, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 776C–777A and Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 111 PL 38 642 here include a comparison with the broad path of Matt 7:13, and Cyril has as well a list of the characteristics of travelers on the broad path: the shameful and pleasure-seeking life; debauchery in food, drink, and sensual pleasures; devotion to wickedness; greed; the empty image of temporal honours; neglect of the divine commandments.

24 Cf the rich man who cannot reach heaven any more than a camel can pass through the gate (or eye of the needle), 18:25 and its paraphrase below, with n25, and the parallels at Matt 19:24 and Mark 10:25. Hugh of St Cher (on 13:24) 216r says that only those who put down every worldly burden (*sarcina*, also the word in the paraphrase here) will be received by Christ.

25 Erasmus' text does not signal (as modern texts do through quotation marks) where he judges the householder's remark that begins in verse 27 should

'You who have put temporal pleasures before eternal bliss, go to the place where there will be wailing and gnashing of teeth. For your misfortune will be increased by the sight of the bliss of others whom you had persecuted here. For you will see your forefathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets whom your forefathers either persecuted or killed, at table in the kingdom of God, and yourselves their descendants banished from their midst; and you will see that the privilege of your race and kinship is no help to you: keeping the Law will have been no help, nor listening to me teach, nor doing miracles. Entry to this bliss had to be by faith.

'Another thing too will be added that will sear your hearts even more sharply. When you, who thought that you alone would be welcomed, have been turned away, they will come from every nation of the whole world, from every quarter of the earth, without distinction or special standing, without any blood tie to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, or any knowledge of the Law or personal association with me; and instantly on being adopted among the sons of Abraham through faith they will take their places at table in the kingdom of God. So the matter will turn out quite the opposite of your expectation. Those who seemed closest to salvation will be cast out far from salvation, and those who in your judgment were considered furthest from God – idolaters, centurions, tax collectors, soldiers, prostitutes – will have the chief honour in the kingdom of God.'[26]

* * * * *

end and Jesus should resume speaking in his own person. In the absence of any such signal, the translation follows the modern convention of attributing everything from the comment about wailing and gnashing of teeth to Jesus, not the householder.

26 Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 780C–D (also in the *Catena aurea* on 13:30) and Nicholas of Lyra (on 13:29–30) specify that the comment about those who come from all quarters of the earth and about the last being first and the first last reflects the supplanting of the Jews by the gentiles; Erasmus' elaboration here presumes the same meaning.
The comment about the last being first and the first last in the Vulgate of Erasmus' day read, 'Those who were last are first, and those who were first are last.' Valla *Annot in Lucam* 13 had already remarked that Jesus has been speaking of future time and here too means a future reversal of present circumstances. He ends, 'For it should read like this: "And look, those who are last will be first, ἔσονται, and those who are first will be last, ἔσονται." Thus the whole speech is about the future.' Erasmus' own annotation *qui erant novissimi* (on 13:30) makes the same point about ἔσονται in the Greek text and about the coming inversion of the present world order. The paraphrase follows the traditional Vulgate past tenses to describe the current last and first but changes to future tenses for the new order in the kingdom of God.

Now since Jesus was teaching these things, disagreeable to the ears of the Jews, everywhere with considerable outspokenness, some Pharisees, in order to shut the mouth of the gospel by causing some fear, approached Jesus and said, 'Take thought for your life and leave Galilee. For Herod the king of this province wishes you ill and is hunting for an opportunity to kill you. If you are not careful, he will treat you no more gently than he treated John.'[27]

But Jesus made it clear that he was in no danger from any man unless he himself chose to be, and that he would not die except at the time that had been set, and by no other type of death, and in no other place, than had been fixed. He said to them, 'Go and tell that fox, who thinks that with his human cunning[28] he has any power against God's plan: "Look, what I am doing is not human, and it may not stop until the time appointed by God." Herod has no standing in this business. For as Herod's authority cannot guarantee that anyone will do these things, likewise it cannot prevent anyone from carrying through with what he is doing. And why should he prevent me if what I am doing is good? I cast out demons and dispel illnesses. I do these things without payment and will not do them long. The time is short, though many might wish it longer, but it has been decided by my Father and me that I would do these things for human salvation today and tomorrow, and on the third day I put the finishing touch on my

* * * * *

The paraphrase on verses 25–30 is a mosaic of amplification based on concentrated scriptural allusion and cross-reference. Here is a sampling of themes and passages for comparison, in the order of their appearance in the paraphrase: 'storm the entrance,' 16:16; invitation not heeded, 14:15–24; 'I hear the name "Lord",' Matt 7:21; 'him whose slaves you are,' 16:13, John 8:34–5; 'you were born among us,' 4:16–22, Mark 6:3, John 6:42; disciples who have healed in Jesus' name, 10:18, Matt 7:22; following in Jesus' footsteps, 9:23; servants who suffer with Jesus will be at the banquet with him, 22:28–30; entry by faith, Heb 4:2–3; adoption by faith, Rom 8:15, Gal 3:26–4:7.

27 Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 924C also notes that the Pharisees intend to frighten Jesus and thus put a stop to his teaching; Hugh of St Cher (on 13:31) 216v attributes the same motive to some of the Pharisees while crediting others with an honest enthusiasm for Jesus. Nicholas of Lyra (on 13:31) makes a similar observation but believes Jesus is being told to leave Judea, whereas the interlinear *Gloss* (on 13:31), Theophylact, and Hugh, like Erasmus, know that Jesus is in Galilee, Herod's territory.

28 The association between the fox and the qualities of deceit and cunning is made by Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 782B (also in the *Catena aurea* on 13:32) and Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 509C, followed by the *Gloss* (on 13:32) and Hugh of St Cher (on 13:32) 217r; the Latin writers add allegorical implications not found in the paraphrase here.

deeds.[29] So it is proper in this brief time not to cease from the appointed task but rather to do what was appointed with an effort as great as the time is short. I am not therefore to flee Herod but to seek Jerusalem, where my death has been appointed, so that the ungodliness of that city, which prides herself on her reputation for religiosity, may be made clear to everyone. She is indeed the well-known ancient slayer of the prophets. And it is not fitting for any prophet to die outside of Jerusalem.'[30]

And now the merciful Lord, who in accordance with his goodness desired all to be saved, foreseeing that ultimate destruction threatened the incurable city, wept over her who had so often spurned the goodness of God though he called her to better things and who had earned final vengeance.[31] 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the ancient slayer of prophets and stoner of those who were sent to you, how often have I tried to gather your children together and join them to me, just as the hen gathers her chicks under her wings lest they perish![32] But your stubbornness has overcome my goodness. And you reject everything by which you could be healed, just as if you were vowed to destruction! So since you set no limit on your ungodliness grim

* * * * *

29 In the Gospel text of verse 32 Jesus says, 'I cast out demons and heal *today and tomorrow, and on the third day* I die,' and in verse 33 'I must walk *today and tomorrow and the next day,*' almost identical expressions though differently punctuated. Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 925A–C observes that the phrase means nothing more than in or for a short time. The paraphrase does not attempt to imitate the doubling of the phrase but uses it once and mentions more generally the shortness of the time before Jesus' death.
With 'put the finishing touches on my deeds' (*summam manum meis factis impono*) compare *Adagia* I ii 34: *Summam manum addere* 'To add the final touch' CWE 31 176. This is Erasmus' paraphrase on the Vulgate's *consummor*. As he had said in the annotation *tertio die consumor* (on 13:32), the passive verb *consummor* (which he spelled with two m's, not the one of his lemma) represents the Greek middle τελειοῦμαι 'bring to completion' and in his view would have been better translated by a Latin active verb instead of a passive, 'so that we would understand that he is going to finish his work on the third day.'

30 Erasmus' annotation *quia non capit* (on 13:33) had said that the Vulgate *non capit* is an impersonal use of the verb, 'as if one were to say "the nature of things does not admit of."' The paraphrase replaces this late Latin use of *capit* with the classical impersonal *convenit* 'it is ... fitting.' Hugh of St Cher (on 13:33) 217r notes that *capit* means *convenit* 'it is fitting.'

31 'Wept over her' is borrowed from 19:41.

32 Erasmus substitutes for the 'bird' and 'nest' of this Gospel the 'hen' and 'chicks' of Matt 23:37. The annotation *quemadmodum avis* (on 13:34) points out that the Greek text's ὄρνις could equally well mean 'bird' and 'hen,' and that this behaviour is characteristic of all birds but especially of domestic fowl.

disaster threatens you.[33] For your house will be abandoned and left to you, so that scarcely any trace of your city will survive, though she now takes pride in herself as the capital of religion. All your glory will be taken away from you and will go to a new home among the gentiles.[34] You yourselves will pass sentence against yourselves. You will indeed kill me, but I assure you, you will not see me until you say, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord." This will be your proclamation, which truth will wrest from you; yet even so you will soon revert to the character of your ancestors and kill the one you proclaim.'

Chapter 14

Later on it happened that he was invited to a banquet[1] by one of the leading Pharisees, went to the man's house, and had the meal with him. It was the sabbath day. Now many other Pharisees were also at table with him; as was their fashion they watched to see if Jesus might do or say something that they could use as a slander against him. And indeed, an opportunity for slander was ready to hand. For also present was a man afflicted with dropsy, usually an incurable illness, characterized by a sallow colour and a swollen body.[2] But coming into Jesus' sight did this sufferer good. For

* * * * *

33 From this point on, 'you' and 'your' translate the Latin plural pronominals, as Jesus no longer addresses the city but all its inhabitants; Erasmus is following the similar shift in the Gospel text at verse 35.

34 These two sentences keep the future tense of verse 35 in Erasmus' Vulgate text, *relinquetur vobis domus vestra* 'your house will be deserted,' even though the annotation *ecce relinquetur* (on 13:35) had pointed out that the Greek verb is present tense and the Latin verb should be also.

1 Nicholas of Lyra (on 14:1), apparently alone among Erasmus' usual sources, notes that the Pharisee had invited Jesus to dine, though he adds, as Erasmus does not, that it was done with malicious intent.

2 The symptoms of dropsy that Erasmus mentions here, plus liver involvement (see n6 below), intestinal difficulties, and thirst (all in the paraphrase on verse 6 below) are familiar to him from Horace, one of his favourite poets, who in *Odes* 2.2.13–16 says, *Crescit indulgens sibi dirus hydrops / nec sitim pellit, nisi causa morbi / fugerit venis et aquosus albo / corpore languor* 'Indulging itself, grim dropsy swells / and does not quench its thirst unless the cause of the disease / and the waterlogged lethargy / flees the veins and whiteish flesh.' For Erasmus' fondness for Horace, see the biographical sketch by Beatus Rhenanus, where Erasmus is said to have learned all of Terence and of Horace by heart as a boy (Allen I iv, lines 540–1).

unhappy is the sinner who removes himself from the sight of the one who wants everyone to be healed. Now Jesus, not unaware of what the Pharisees and lawyers were thinking to themselves,[3] asked them, 'Is it right to grant healing to a desperately ill person on the sabbath?' When they held their tongues, Jesus called the man with dropsy to him, healed him with a touch, and told him to go. The man's colour changed on the spot, and the swelling in his body went down.

Although this was a marvellous deed, the violation of reverence for the sabbath still offended the Pharisees. But Jesus showed that their religion was absurd because they were offended at the salvation of a human but not at saving a donkey. Replying to their silent thoughts[4] he said, 'If a donkey or an ox belonging to one of you had fallen into a well on the sabbath day, would he wait until the sabbath had passed? Would he not instead unhesitatingly pull his animal out at once that very day so it wouldn't die? If the welfare of an ox or donkey is so important to you that you wouldn't think the sabbath is violated, why does your heart take offence because on the sabbath day I saved this man who was in immediate danger from dropsy? If the amount of work is a consideration, there is more work in pulling out an animal than in saving this man. I saw him, I touched him, and sent him on his way.[5] If you consider the person, the welfare of one human being ought to be more important to you than that of many oxen or donkeys.'

At these words the Pharisees were silent, for their hearts were so corrupted and depraved that though they had no reply to make to the plain truth, they still could not approve what they saw Jesus do. Yet if they themselves could have done anything of the kind, they would have blasted forth their glory on every available trumpet. But since our Lord Jesus wanted all the glory of his deeds to rest with God his Father, he everywhere stripped bare the counterfeit sanctimony of the Pharisees, who for too long had imposed on simple people. For they chased after their

* * * * *

3 Though no one had yet spoken to Jesus, the Greek and Latin text of verse 3 says 'And Jesus answering spake' (AV). The interlinear *Gloss* notes that the answer is to the malicious watchers of verse 1, whose thoughts, according to Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 511A, Hugh of St Cher (on 14:3) 218r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 14:3), are perceptible to the Lord.

4 Erasmus' Greek and Latin texts of verse 5, included, like verse 3, 'answering'; see the preceding note. Here again Nicholas of Lyra (on 14:5) says that the answer is to the Pharisees' unspoken thoughts.

5 Here, as in the paraphrase on 13:16, Erasmus goes beyond the Gospel text to note that less actual work is required to heal people than to tend animals in the way permitted by the Law.

own glory among humankind, and therefore were jealous of the glory of God. And this was the true dropsy of the heart, arising from the mind's corrupted judgment as from a bad liver.[6] Locating glory in things in which there was no call to boast, they were swollen externally with empty pride and internally with the wretched corruption and putrefaction of all their inner parts. Hence the Lord, who with a touch had healed the man with dropsy, desired to heal their disease too with the medicine of his salvific word.[7]

For whatever the Pharisees did they did for pride and empty show.[8] They walked about in phylacteries, they prayed on the street corners, they gave alms to the sound of a trumpet, they fasted with faces artfully dirtied, in the public square they went hunting for magniloquent greetings, at dinner parties they cornered the seats of honour.[9] So great was their thirst for the most foolish glory, so great was their swollen-headedness; but inside nothing was sound. Yet the man who was suffering with dropsy was easily healed, because he acknowledged his illness and desired to be healed. The illness of the heart cannot be healed if you do not acknowledge it. So Jesus wanted to rebuke the pride of those whom the prominent Pharisee had invited not for hospitality but for show, because when they were invited to dinner parties they jockeyed for the more honourable place, smug if they got hold of a more dignified seat and aggrieved if a less honourable place came their way.

We still see that the solemn parades of rabbis are like this, whenever they process from synagogue to banquet.[10] In the synagogue they sit high

* * * * *

6 The discussion of dropsy by the first century AD Roman physician Celsus includes a passage on involvement of the liver; Celsus *De medicina* 3.21.15.

7 'Word' is *sermo* again, this time viewed as a drug; cf the Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited and Ep 1381, the preface to this paraphrase, generally.

8 In this and the preceding paragraph Erasmus draws an analogy between dropsy and the spiritual pride and glory seeking of the Pharisees. The Latin exegetical tradition, at least from the time of Bede, instead took dropsy as an allegory for greed; cf Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 511B–D, the interlinear and marginal *Gloss* (on 14:4), Nicholas of Lyra (on 14:5). Erasmus' emphasis on pride and glory seeking provides him with a transition to the next segment of the chapter, the parable on the proper behaviour of wedding guests.

9 The description of these behaviours draws on Matt 6:5, 6:16, and 23:2–7.

10 The outburst that follows in this paragraph against the pompous behaviour of 'rabbis' is surely to be understood as aimed at religious and academic dignitaries of Erasmus' own day, though it fits the portrayal of such persons in the Gospels as well; see the previous note. In the *1519* annotation on Matt 23:2, discussing contemporary applications of that passage to church leaders, Erasmus

up, looking down as if from a height on the others, quicker to elbow their neighbour out of the way than to yield their place to anyone. The passerby makes way for them on the street, with much repetition of their courtesy titles; they are offended if someone does not rise when they pass, or does not uncover his head, or dares to sit down before one of them has come in and sat down. Meanwhile time is wasted in these silly ceremonies so that there is no time to learn something. And in fact those rabbis do not come in order to learn or teach, but to chase after glory in the eyes of the people. They arrive with a great parade, but they leave with a greater one. You would say that annual games were being held, or that a rich man's funeral procession was marching.[11] Here again there is a contest for position. There is no one who does not think a grave wrong has been done if he is on the left of some apparent inferior.[12] Again at the dinner party there is an amazing

* * * * *

had said, 'So now too perhaps a bishop should be heeded who teaches the gospel correctly even if he himself lives a life too little like the gospel.' In *1522* and *1527* he expanded that annotation with increasingly forthright remarks about bad bishops. For the repetition of 'rabbi' as honorific, see chapter 11 n59 above. Since 'rabbi' means 'teacher', as pointed out in the annotation on Matt 23:8, Erasmus attacks 'rabbis' here for neither teaching nor learning. Noël Béda and the Paris faculty of theology did not miss the reference to contemporary practice. Béda had included this passage in his set of objections to the *Paraphrase on Luke* and is quoted by Erasmus as saying, *Taxat magistros nostros, quos Rabinos vocat* 'He criticizes our doctors of theology, whom he calls rabbis.' Erasmus replied to Béda in the *Divinationes*, exclaiming, 'How could Luke criticize *magistros nostros* when he didn't know them? ... But if such as Christ describes here are found among *magistros nostros*, let them change what the Lord condemns, and not blame me' (LB IX 493A–B). *Magistri nostri*, literally 'our teachers,' was jargon of the day for doctors of theology or theologians; see Paul Grendler 'How to Get a Degree in Fifteen Days: Erasmus' Doctorate of Theology from the University of Turin' ERSY 18 (1998) 63 and n71.

11 *ludi solennes* 'annual games' suggests the public games in honour of the Greek and Roman gods often mentioned in classical literature. A 'rich man's funeral' was always liable to be an occasion of rebuke for lavish display; see the paraphrase on Mark 5:40 CWE 49 73 and nn28 and 30.

12 *si laevum claudat latus ei, qui videtur inferior* 'is on the left side of some apparent inferior' is modelled on Juvenal 3.131–2, an expression of dismay at the toadying the impoverished better classes must lavish on the low-born rich: *divitis hic servo cludit latus ingenuorum / filius* 'here the son of freeborn parents is at the side of a rich man's slave.' See also Horace *Satires* 2.5.18, where a 'heroic' character is similarly dismayed at having to be on the left of a much less respectable individual. For the Romans, taking a position at the left or 'outside' of a distinguished person expressed respect for that person; Eutropius 7.13.44 remarks on the extraordinarily courteous (*civilis*) behaviour of

competition over place. Why go on? Whatever they do is dropsy, is a chase after empty glory, since they want to be regarded as gods by the people.

Hence Jesus, wanting to teach those suffering with this sort of disease that true glory is not what one solicits but what one avoids even when it is well deserved, set before them a parable of the following kind, so courteously touching the conscience of each one that even in so doing he betrayed no one.[13] 'When you have been invited,' he said, 'to a wedding banquet, be careful that you don't pre-empt the most important seat, lest after you have taken your place another more honoured[14] than you also arrive; and then the one who invited both you and him will come forward and tell you to get up and yield your place to the more honoured man. Then you will earn shame instead of the glory you grasped at, and you will be compelled, to your embarrassment, to have the lowest place. Instead, when you are invited to a banquet in high society, pick for yourself the last place at table, so that when your host comes he will say, "Friend, come up to a more honoured place." Then your modesty will be to your glory in the eyes of the rest of the guests. They will recognize your modesty from your choosing the last place for yourself; your true rank they will recognize from the host. Thus it is in human life: the greater one is, the more he should humble himself, till the one comes who in true and everlasting glory lifts up those who are humble in the world's eyes, and casts down the haughty and proud.'[15]

Likewise in the kingdom of God, the common people have been welcomed even to the height of apostolic rank, but priests, Pharisees, scribes, and lawyers have been rejected. The gentiles, acknowledging their humbleness, have been carried up[16] to partnership in eternal glory. The Jews, who

* * * * *

the emperor Claudius, who honored a victorious general by walking at his left during the triumphal procession to the temple of Jupiter for the ritual sacrifices.

13 The courtesy of Jesus' indirect reproof of the dinner guests' behaviour is noted by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1841D and Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 785D (also in the *Catena aurea* on 14:4).

14 In the annotation *honoratior est* (on 14:8) Erasmus notes that the Vulgate's *honoratior* 'more honoured' translates a Greek word that 'means both dearer and more highly valued.' Still he does not change the choice of words here, even using *honoratior* three times for the Vulgate's once.

15 Hugh of St Cher (on 14:11) 218v compares the wording here of part of the Magnificat (Luke 1:52), a passage with several Old Testament parallels.

16 The lifetime editions read *evecti* 'carried up' here; LB follows the 1540 edition

wanted to reign alone at this banquet, now have either no place or the last place. And this parable certainly applied to the arrogant Pharisees.

The Lord added another parable that applied specifically to the prominent Pharisee. For as long as the rich want to appear hospitable, they do not invite those whose need they could relieve but those by whom they could be invited in return, or from whom they could snare some glory for themselves. And that is not hospitality but self-seeking or greed or both. For generosity is that which freely bestows a benefit on anyone without hope of the favour's being returned. The parable goes like this: 'If you want to arrange your banquet well, whenever you are inclined to give a luncheon or a dinner, do not invite your friends, who have no need of your generosity or who have been obliging to you, lest you seem to be either paying them back or grasping at a favour or inviting them out of shame so you won't seem ungrateful; and do not invite your kinsmen or neighbours, lest the kindness seem paid to the relationship, not to friendly feeling; and do not invite rich neighbours, lest you lose the good will for putting on a banquet. And lose it you will if they invite you in turn[17] and a similar or even more elegant banquet is put on. For if the courtesies are weighed against each other in this way, no thanks will be owing. But if you want to arrange your banquet well, one from which ample recompense will return to you not from mortals but from God, invite the poor, the weak, the blind, and the lame. Refresh God, by relieving these.[18]

'You will say, "Effort and expense will go to waste on such people. For they have nothing with which to repay the favour, and they are always in need." You will be blessed for the very reason that they do not have the wherewithal to repay.[19] But they do have a very wealthy patron, who will

* * * * *

and prints *erecti* 'raised,' though noting that 'another edition' has *evecti*. *Evehere, evectus* 'carry up' is normal classical Latin for elevation to life among the gods; cf Virgil *Aeneid* 6.130, Horace *Odes* 1.1.6, Ovid *Metamorphoses* 14.127.

17 *te vicissim invitent*. The *1522* annotation *honoratior est* (on 14:8) criticizes the Vulgate translator for inventing the word *reinvitent* 'reinvite' in imitation of the Greek verb in the verse. Erasmus proposes rather *vicissim vocent sive invitent* 'bid or invite in turn,' and in the paraphrase here adopts his own suggestion.

18 Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 788B–C gives a summary quotation of Matt 25:34–40, ending 'as you did it to one of these, you did it to me,' to illustrate the spiritual effect of inviting to the feast those who cannot reciprocate.

19 In the annotation *non habent retribuere* (on 14:14) Erasmus, following Valla, had said that in the Latin text *non habent* 'they do not have' [in the sense 'possess,' ie to repay] is not as good a choice to translate the Greek as *non possunt* 'they

let what is spent on them be a charge on him. He will repay eternal things for transitory ones. Do not demand payment too hastily. The credit of him in whom you trust is good. For he will surely pay you back, if not in this life (though he will pay back here too), certainly at the resurrection of the just.' Now this parable of the Lord applied not only to relieving the poor at a banquet but to assisting every need of one's neighbour, whether he has to be instructed or admonished or comforted or advanced towards salvation by any other act of loving service. And these things are to be furnished for God's sake, not a mortal's.

When Jesus had said this about the wedding banquet and about the resurrection of the just, one of the guests, as if touched in a dream by desire for that heavenly banquet, said, 'Blessed is the one to whom it will fall to eat bread in the kingdom of God,' as if hinting that there would be few to whom such bliss would come, and as if not just anyone was to be admitted to that banquet but only Jews, or the leading men of the Jews.[20] But Jesus, setting another parable before them, taught that the Jews had indeed been invited to the first place, so that they could not complain that they had been spurned, but as long as they were themselves given over to earthly things and though invited refused to come, because they considered perishable goods worth

* * * * *

are not able' [to repay]; he adds that the Greek verb ἔχω 'have' with infinitives frequently means 'be able.' In the paraphrase here he keeps *non habent*. But instead of imitating the Vulgate by putting a Latin infinitive he more elegantly substitutes a relative clause with a subjunctive verb to characterize what they do not have, both in this sentence, which strictly paraphrases verse 14a, and in the preceding sentence, which expresses the imagined objection of his listeners. Preserving *non habent*, besides echoing a familiar Vulgate text, allows him to make more forcefully the contrasting assertion that follows: 'But they do have [*habent*] a very wealthy patron.'

20 In restricting the interpretation of the guest's exclamation to the Jews or the leaders among them, Erasmus alludes to an explanation of the following parable that is widespread in the exegetical tradition, both Greek and Latin. Though some among his predecessors regard the three orders of invitees as representing Jews, gentiles, and heretics, many see the first order, the originally invited guests, as symbolizing only the leading Jews; the poor and handicapped in the city, then, are the humbler classes of Jews who did accept Jesus, and those outside the the city limits are the gentiles. Cf Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.30, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 789D (also in the *Catena aurea* on 14:18–21), Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 36 PL 76 1270C–D, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 514A–516C, the *Gloss* (on 14:22), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 936C and 937C, Hugh of St Cher (on 14:21) 220V, Nicholas of Lyra (on 14:21–3).

more than eternal life, all nations without distinction were to be invited, so that the gathering of the church might be completed. The parable went like this: 'A very rich man had decided to put on a grand dinner. To it he had invited many people. And when the time for the dinner was quite near, he sent his slave to announce to all the invited guests that the time for the dinner was at hand and that they should hurry. (Once he had invited them through the prophets; now he was declaring it again through John and the Son of Man.)[21] "Come," he said, "for everything is ready now."[22] Although it was now possible to enjoy this long-awaited dinner they all began at once to make excuses, one on this pretext and another on that.[23] For the first one, bent on increasing his household wealth and putting the profit of earthly possession ahead of that of eternal bliss, replied when the servant pressed him, "I have bought a property in the country, and I must make a journey to inspect my purchase. Please excuse me to your master." Off to the next one. He, suffering a like disease, replied, "I have bought five yoke of oxen. So I must go to test them to see if I have made a good bargain. Please have your master excuse me. I would like to come, if only I could." Off to the third. He too excused himself, saying, "I have married a wife, and you know how busy a matter that is, how many cares it brings with it, and therefore however much I would like to, it is not possible to come now."[24]

* * * * *

21 The prophets, John, and Jesus himself are pointed out by Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 69 (70) PG 58 648 (on Matt 22:1–6) as the carriers of invitations to the Jews; much of the exegetical tradition on the present passage mentions instead the prophets, Jesus, and the apostles.

22 Though the Vulgate text had translated the Greek here as an indirect statement – 'to say to the guests that they should come,' Erasmus noted in the annotation *ut venirent* (on 14:17) that the Greek sentence is in direct speech and suggested that the Latin translator's Greek text was faulty.

23 Throughout the report of the regrets that the slave is to relay to the host, Erasmus like the Vulgate uses the verb *excusare* 'to make an excuse.' He had remarked in the annotation *simul omnes excusare* (on 14:18) that a more literal translation of the Greek παραιτεῖσθαι would be *recusare* 'refuse,' but that the Latin translator had elegantly substituted *excusare* to keep the reader mindful that these refusals are all accompanied by alleged reasons.

24 In general the exegetical tradition sees allegorical meaning in the excuses offered by the invited guests. Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 936C–937B, however, after presenting his own allegorical explanation, adds that a literal interpretation is quite valid too, since such literal matters do absorb our attention and prevent us from paying attention to God. Erasmus also finds the literal interpretation sufficient to his purposes.

'When all had excused themselves on these and similar pretexts, the slave came back and reported to his master. Then the master, offended because those he had freely invited to so honourable and happy a banquet were all excusing themselves for trivial reasons, wanted them to be all the more incensed later on when they learned how great an affair they had scorned and who these were who had succeeded to fellowship in the bliss they had scorned. So he said to the slave who carried the invitations, "Go out quickly into all the squares and streets of this city, and whatever weak, blind, and lame you meet,[25] bring them here to my banquet. I have invited these others first to honour them; they have nothing to complain of. Their scorn will not ruin my banquet. There will be some to enjoy it, even if those despise the honour offered them. I shall see to it that those who think themselves[26] great will envy the blind, the weak, the lame, and the lowliest of all humankind."

The slave came back and having carried out what the householder had ordered said to him, "My lord, I have brought all kinds of people, even right off the streets, and yet some part of your banquet will still have room. For you have prepared a very abundantly supplied banquet, one with a capacity for countless guests." And the master, wanting the banquet he had had prepared to benefit as many as possible, said to the slave, "Go out again, even go outside the city into the highways and hedgerows, and gather up the beggars and strangers everywhere no matter how unknown. If they are reluctant to come, insist relentlessly that they come to me, and let my house be filled at last. But I assure you all[27] of this, that not one of those men who were shown such honour that they were the first to be invited and yet scorned it will taste of my dinner. Perhaps someday they will be sorry, when they see the elegance and splendour of the banquet, and they will envy those for whom their scorn made room. But they will want entry then in vain, since they made their excuses when they could have come."'[28]

* * * * *

25 Erasmus here omits the 'poor' of the Gospel text of verse 21, but adds 'the lowliest of all humankind' four sentences below.

26 *sibi videntur* 'think themselves' is the reading of *1534*, *1535*, and LB. The 1523 and 1524 editions had *tibi* instead of *sibi*, which would make the phrase mean 'seem to you.'

27 *vobis* 'you all.' Verse 24 in Greek and Latin also uses the plural 'you' here. Who in the implied audience would 'you all' be? RSV, NRSV, and Fitzmyer AB Luke agree in ascribing the verse to the master in the parable, not to Jesus, and the translation here follows suit.

28 The thought here, and at the beginning of the previous paragraph, echoes that of 13:24–30 and its parallels in adding to the Gospel's 'none of those men

Having said this at the Pharisees' banquet, Jesus proceeded on his way to Jerusalem. A huge crowd of people accompanied him on foot. Many followed his footsteps who could not have followed his way of life. For he was going to the cross, for which anyone who wants to be his disciple should be prepared.[29] So turning to those following him, he said, 'Not everyone who follows me on feet of flesh and blood is truly my disciple. Let no one join me unless he is prepared for the same things to which I am hastening. Whoever wants to be my permanent disciple must renounce all human affections. For anyone who comes to me and does not yet hate his father and mother, his wife, children, brothers and sisters, why, even his very own life as well, cannot be my disciple. And anyone who is reluctant to take up his cross and in that way follow me cannot be my disciple. On the contrary, anyone who comes to me in bondage to human passions for wealth, honours, pleasures, parents, kith and kin, or in bondage to lust for life and terror of death, will recoil from his undertaking at the first chance.[30] So before you approach a task by no means frivolous prepare your heart for all the hardships that must be endured. Otherwise not to have undertaken it would be more bearable than to fail in what you have begun.

'At the least you must display here that prudence that many people display in matters much more trivial. For who among you is so improvident that, having in mind to build a tower, he instantly and recklessly sets out to do what he is thinking of? Not only does he think, "I'll have a tower," but before he lays the foundation, he sits quietly and calculates with himself how much expenditure will be needed to bring a tower to completion. If he perceives that his wealth is too limited to bear the necessary cost, he holds

* * * * *

who were invited shall taste my banquet' the idea that the original guests will regret their refusal when it is too late. Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 36 PL 76 1272C, followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 516C, says, 'Let no one scorn it, lest he excuse himself when invited only to be unable to enter when he has come to desire it.'

29 Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 940D and Hugh of St Cher (on 14:25) 221r both note at this point that many of the crowd following Jesus did so without a wholehearted commitment to his teaching, and that was the reason why he here took up the question of the commitment and its costs.

30 While this sentence may be only a predictable rhetorical restatement by reversal of the gist of what precedes it, it may also owe something to the observation of Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 941A that in verse 26 Jesus is teaching his disciples to be so free of ties of relationship that family and friends do not become an obstacle to reverence for God or to good works.

back, lest once the foundation is laid he then leave off because he cannot finish it, and all who pass by and see the work started and left undone begin to mock him, saying, "This man started building what he couldn't complete." So if shame in human eyes carries such weight that no one dares to begin a building unless he has considered his personal resources, how much more ought you calculate your strength of heart before you proclaim that you will be my followers? For if once you begin to recoil from me, great will be your shame in the eyes of God's angels.[31] Following me is no trifling matter. It is not enough to talk in grand terms unless your strength is equal to the task.

'For what king is so unthinking that, if he is preparing an expedition against another king, he does not sit quietly before he does anything else and calculate the resources of his kingdom, whether it is a good idea, with a force of ten thousand men, to confront a foe coming against him[32] with twenty thousand? But if he finds[33] his resources unequal to the conflict, before the other moves his army closer he sends ambassadors to him to negotiate conditions of peace. That is surely more bearable than to risk the chance of war[34] with unequal resources. For it is more honourable to discuss a settlement before battle is joined than to accept peace on even less honourable terms after a disastrous loss. But if in matters like these people know how to calculate what they can supply before they start, how much more ought they do the same in the present business, than which there is no other greater, or one calling for more courage? Therefore, whoever of you follows me and does not out of love renounce all he possesses cannot be my disciple. One must be either an unconditional disciple or none at all. For nothing is baser than one who, overcome by the lusts of the flesh, recoils from the task he has undertaken, the profession of gospel perfection.[35]

* * * * *

31 With reference to all those who mock work left undone, on the mortal and divine planes, the *Gloss* (on 14:29) quotes 1 Cor 4:9: 'We have become a spectacle to the world, to angels and to men.'

32 In the annotation *ad se* (on 14:31) Erasmus had taken issue with the Vulgate's *ad se* 'to him' as a translation of the Greek ἐπ' αὐτόν 'against him,' remarking, 'Why not rather *contra se* or *adversus se*?' Here in the paraphrase he substitutes *adversus se*.

33 LB has the present indicative *comperit* but notes that 'another edition' has the future perfect *compererit*. In fact the lifetime editions all have this reading. The choice between the two is immaterial to the sense.

34 *Martis aleam*. Erasmus uses a common Roman metonymy, the name of Mars, the god of war, for war itself.

35 *perfectio*, the reading of the editions of 1523, 1535, and LB; *1524* and *1534* have *profectio* 'advance.'

'What is more, my disciple should be like salt. If salt has its strength, it is good for preserving and seasoning all food.[36] But once it stops being salt and its natural force vanishes, so that the salt itself needs salt, it cannot in any way be made good for any purpose. For it cannot season anything or be seasoned by other salt. Other things, even if they are spoiled, still have some use: wine, for instance – when it goes bad,[37] it turns to vinegar. But salt, produced for a great thing indeed but one thing only, if it loses its savour is good for no human purpose – it is not even useful[38] for the dungheap, where even the most rotten things are thrown. For when mixed with manure it causes sterility, and far from producing any utility it actually harms whatever it touches.'

In these words our Lord Jesus reproved the recklessness of some who wanted to be seen as disciples of Christ, though he was well aware that even those few whom he had chosen from all would fail him in the face of the horror of the cross. But so that these words might be grafted into their minds, to be understood later on, he added, 'Let whoever has ears capable of such things hear this.' For it is not the ears of just anyone that can endure words of this kind.[39]

Chapter 15

Now since a whole crowd of people was thronging towards Jesus while he neither brushed aside nor scorned anyone, some tax collectors and sinners dared to come even closer to him. The Pharisees typically de-

* * * * *

36 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 519B, the *Gloss* (on 14:35), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 945A–C, and Hugh of St Cher (on 14:35) 221r remark on both the preserving and the seasoning functions of salt and point out that salt here is a metaphor for the disciples of Christ; cf Matt 5:13.

37 *vapuerit*, from *vapescere* 'to turn, as of wine,' is a verb apparently not found before Erasmus' day but used by him eg in Allen Ep 2880:14 and by one of his correspondents in Allen Ep 2895:34.

38 *utilis*, the masculine form of the adjective. In the annotation *utile est* (on 14:35) Erasmus says that he is not troubled by the Vulgate's use of *sal* 'salt' as a neuter noun modified by the neuter *utile*, since he knows it is found that way too; still, he adds, it is masculine more commonly, and among the better authors. In the paraphrase he adopts the practice of the better authors.

39 Erasmus paraphrases in a way to make it explicit in the last few sentences that Jesus' words about salt have a metaphorical application to would-be disciples; cf n36 above. Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 945B–C says that Jesus adds the closing remark about ears (verse 35b) to alert his listeners to look for a more than literal meaning. Still, it is not clear in the Latin whether this last sentence is to be attributed to Jesus or to the narrator of the *Paraphrase*.

test this class of people intensely, as a display of their own sanctimony, though the surest sign of sanctity is not to scorn the sinner but to make every effort to see that he repents, and to rejoice with him when he does. And so when the Pharisees,[1] who thought themselves righteous even though they were inwardly full of scorn, jealousy, hatred, avarice, and pride, saw that Jesus was making himself available without reluctance to tax collectors and others notorious for open wrongdoing (pimps and whores are of this class), they grumbled about his mercy, saying, 'Though this man is claiming some new kind of sanctity, he still does not avoid consorting with evildoers but even admits known sinners to conversation; and far from shunning contact, he even eats with them, not thinking how good people are defiled by the company of evildoers.'[2]

But in order to root out this merciless scorn from the hearts of his followers Jesus put before them three parables that urged them by different arguments[3] to the same end, that is, to complete mercifulness towards the repentant sinner, who not only must not be repulsed when he returns to a better frame of mind but also must be invited to repentance by every means available.[4]

* * * * *

1 Erasmus omits the 'scribes' of the Gospel text.

2 Cf 1 Cor 15:33 and *Adagia* I x 74: *Corrumpunt mores bonos colloquia prava* 'Evil communications corrupt good manners' CWE 32 267. The exact adage will appear in the paraphrase on verse 13; see n18 below.

3 *diversis argumentis*. *Argumentum* in Latin has as one of its primary meanings the theme, contents, subject, or plot of a literary work; this meaning is now obsolete or in less common use in English. The other meaning is a line of reasoned argument, proof, or rationale. Both meanings seem intended here.

4 The Latin exegetical traditon asserts thematic unity in the three parables of chapter 15. But whereas Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1845A–B understands the theme to be assurance of the love and mercy that will be found by the repentant, Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 34 PL 76 1246D–1247B sees the self-righteousness of the Pharisees and their scorn for sinners as the main object of Jesus' gentle treatment, who, he says, offers in the parables a 'kindly example' (*benignum paradigma*). He is followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 519D, the *Gloss* (on 15:1), with excerpts from Ambrose as well, and by Hugh of St Cher (on 15:1) 222v. Nicholas of Lyra (on 15:1 and 3) says twice that the point of the three parables is that when sinners return to righteousness they are to be 'kindly received' (*benigne recipiendi*). Erasmus will adopt Gregory's concern with the Pharisees, or expand it more generally to the Jews, at the end of this chapter; see the paraphrases on verses 26 ('the adherent of the old Law'), 30, and 31 below.

The first parable goes like this: 'Each person,' he said, 'can surmise from his own feelings how God does not turn away from the repentant sinner. Is there anyone of you who has a hundred sheep? Each man's property is dear to him, of course, and he does not want to lose any of it. So what would he do if one of the hundred sheep should happen to wander off? Will he not be so troubled by the loss of one that, leaving the ninety-nine in the wilderness, he will hurry off anxiously after the one that is lost and not rest until he finds it? And then what if he happens to find the little lost sheep? Of course he will joyfully put it on his shoulders and reunite it with the flock, happier about the return of the one for whom he had feared than about the safety of the whole flock for which he had no fear. Then too the magnitude of his joy is such that he will not restrain himself from pouring it out before others also. For when he comes home, he calls his friends and neighbours together as if he has been enriched by some notable gain, saying to them, "Rejoice with me and be glad as friends in my joy, since it is right for all things to be shared among friends;[5] for I have found my sheep that was lost."

'If this is the good shepherd's feeling for his flock, what do you suppose is God's feeling for the human race, which he created, which he nurtures, and which he has destined for everlasting bliss to the glory of his name? Is he likely to scorn the sinner whom Satan has led away from the flock? Or, merciful and loving as he is towards the things he has made, will he not rather leave nothing undone to reclaim the lost, and with much rejoicing welcome back the penitent whose loss had caused him pain? I assure you of this, that as the shepherd rejoices with his friends and neighbours because of the return of a single little sheep, so all the angels in heaven will have greater joy about one repentant sinner than about the ninety-nine righteous ones who have no need of penitence.'[6]

This image particularly signified our Lord Jesus, who alone is the supremely good shepherd who has reconciled the fallen human race to the

* * * * *

5 *decet inter amicos esse communia omnia*, a version of *Adagia* I i 1: *Amicorum communia omnia* 'Between friends all is common' CWE 31 29

6 Though the expression in the Gospel text of verse 7 is *poenitentiam agere* 'do penance, repent' Erasmus paraphrases with his preferred term *resipiscere* 'repent' (which he had already used several times in the paraphrase on verse 3 above), though he keeps the Vulgate's *poenitentia* 'penitence' at the end of the sentence. Cf chapter 11 n46. Like some of his predecessors, Erasmus takes the angels of verse 10 to be implied in verse 7 as well; cf Ambrose, *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1846B, the interlinear *Gloss* (on 15:7), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 948D, and Hugh of St Cher (on 15:7) 223r.

Father, paying out of his own resources the penalty that we earned and carrying our sins in his own body. However, though he found no nation that was not in bondage to many sins, still, compared to the other races the Jews seemed to have the appearance of righteousness, in so far as they worshipped one God and kept the Law handed down from God. And there were those among the Jews who, clutching the precepts of the Law more tightly, thought themselves not in need of penitence. But the righteousness of these brought less joy to their holy shepherd than gentiles who repented of great and glaring crimes, of idolatries, of adulteries, of monstrous lusts. And among the Jews Paul, turned from a persecutor into an apostle, was a greater illustration of the mercy of God than if he had mixed Christ with his Judaism in silence, a thing which at that time was done by many.[7]

But the parable applies in general to the apostles and their successors the bishops. These must exhibit the affection of Christ their leader for his flock, at least if they are not merely hired shepherds.[8] For it often happens that those who are converted from extraordinary and glaring sins to true godliness far outstrip in their zeal for godliness those who had never fallen into such wrongdoing.[9] The gospel shepherd will not scorn

* * * * *

7 The interpretations offered here for the parable are also found in the exegetical tradition. Identification of this good shepherd with Christ is reinforced by such passages as Isa 53:4–6, John 10:11–18, and 1 Pet 2:24–5 (verse 24, 'he bore our sins in his body,' is echoed at the beginning of this paragraph). The explicit identification is made by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1845B–1846B, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 797C, Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 34 PL 76 1247B–C, followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 520A and the *Gloss* (on 15:5–6), and Hugh of St Cher (on 15:4–7) 222V–223R, quoting 1 Pet 2:24 and Isa 53:4. For the second interpretation, that the righteousness of the Jews, represented by the ninety-nine, brings less joy than the repentance of the gentiles, represented by the one, cf Hugh (on 15:1 and 2–4) 222V, who describes all three of the parables in this chapter as being specifically directed against particular faults of the Pharisees. Cf also n4 above and n37 below. Those who 'mixed Christ with Judaism in silence' would be people like Nicodemus in John 3:1–15 and 19:38–9; see the paraphrases on these passages CWE 46 44–9 and 215.

8 Cf John 10:12–13 and the paraphrase on that passage CWE 46 132–3.

9 That Christ the good shepherd is a model for the behaviour of apostles and bishops is regularly emphasized by Erasmus in the *Paraphrases*; cf eg the paraphrases on John 6:7–12 CWE 46 77, on John 10:1–16 CWE 46 129–33, on Mark 6:44 CWE 49 85–6, and Jane E. Phillips 'The Gospel, the Clergy, and the Laity in Erasmus' *Paraphrase on the Gospel of John*' ERSY 10 (1990) 85–100. Nicholas of Lyra (*moraliter* on 15:4 and 8) applies the models of the shepherd and the housewife in the next parable to abbots and abbesses, who will exhibit the same kind of behaviour when one of those in their charge goes astray. The

such sinners but will try everything till he bring them back to the fold of the church. When they repent he will welcome them publicly with much joy. Let the Pharisees grumble, for relying on their counterfeit righteousness they do not understand how much more pleasing to God is mercy than sacrifice.[10] Those who are truly righteous, who are friends of the good shepherd, will rejoice with a greater joy over one restored sheep than over the many who put their trust in their own frigid righteousness. For they do not count the earlier errors, which God has freely, once and for all, forgiven and forgotten; instead they applaud the one hastening back to zeal for the new life. He could not return if the shepherd had not carried him back on his shoulders, and therefore the choir of saints applauds the goodness of God, not begrudging another what each has experienced towards himself, and regarding as shared by all whatever of good or ill has fallen to the lot of any single member.[11] Furthermore, it is right that the joy be shared by the entire church, since the grief and worry were shared by all. This then was the first parable with which the Lord censured pharisaical and arrogant righteousness that only hated and shunned sinners, though it is the part of true godliness to see to the salvation of everyone, to call sinners back to better things with the greatest gentleness, to welcome the repentant with the greatest feeling of love. If Christ, who alone knows no sin, practised such mercy, how much more does it behove a human being, himself too in bondage to sin, to do the same towards his neighbour?

The second parable goes like this: 'What woman among you,' he said, 'if one of her ten silver coins is lost, would think nothing of the loss of the one coin because the nine are safe? What then will she do? She will light the lamp, of course; she will sweep out[12] the whole house, she will

* * * * *

special zeal of the repentant is noted by Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 34 PL 76 1248B–C, followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 520C–D.

10 Cf Matt 9:13 and 12:7, both reproaching the Pharisees with Hos 6:6, *misericordiam volui et non sacrificium* (Vulg) 'I desired mercy and not sacrifice' (AV).

11 For the sharing of all joys and sorrows among Christians, cf eg 1 Cor 12:26. 'Choir of saints' may owe something to the mention of 'choirs of angels' (*angelorum choros*) in Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 34 PL 76 1247D, followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 520B and the *Gloss* (on 15:6).

12 *everret*. The Gospel text of Erasmus' day read *evertit* 'overturns,' 'turns out.' In the annotation *evertit* (on 15:8) Erasmus notes that the Greek text says σαροῖ 'sweep clean' and suggests that the Latin translator had written *everrit* but an inexperienced copyist had substituted the more familiar word. He says that Hugh of St Cher's literal and moral interpretations (that the housewife moves the contents of the house, not the structure, as the consciences of sinners are

explore every corner, she will move everything from its place. In short, she will not put an end to her searching until she finds the lost coin. And if she is fortunate enough to find it, so great is her joy about the recovery of the one that she does not restrain herself from pouring out her joy to her friends and neighbours; she will call them together and say to them, "Rejoice with me because I have found the silver coin that I lost." She does not boast about the nine silver coins that had not been lost; she glories in the recovery of the one, and thinks herself richer in this one than in those nine. If a woman feels so strongly towards her coins that she grieves that any is lost and rejoices greatly that whatever was lost is recovered, however small, how much more will God want nothing to be lost from among humankind, to save whom he paid the price of his very self and whom he created in his own image?'[13]

He added a third parable, which, though it also has a general application to every sinner who repents after great crimes, yet in accordance with the mode of the time at which it was said, more particularly describes the gentiles welcomed to the gospel grace and the Jews who thought themselves righteous while begrudging the gentiles' blessedness.[14] The parable

* * * * *

disturbed by spiritual examination) suggests that Hugh was sensitive to some inelegance in the expression. The paraphrase amplifies in a way that corrects the reading but also accommodates the traditional (and Hugh's) version: 'she will move everything from its place' (*nihil non movebit loco*).

13 'Whom he created in his own image' alludes to a standard exegetical interpretation of this parable. It is related to the account of Jesus' looking at a Roman coin with the portrait of the Roman ruler and saying, 'Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's' (20:21–5, Matt 22:15–22, Mark 12:13–17; see the paraphrases on these passages, below and LB VII 116C–117D, 249A–F) and from there points to the statement in Gen 1:26–7 that humans were created in the image of God. Hence the coin with its image stands for the divine image for which the human searches within the soul. See eg Gregory of Nyssa *De virginitate* PG 46 372A–D (also in the *Catena aurea* on 15:8–10), Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1846B, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 800C (also in the *Catena aurea* on 15:8–10), Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 34 PL 76 1249A–B, followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 521B and the *Gloss* (on 15:8), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 15:8).

14 The parable of the prodigal son, the climax of these three parables (cf n4 above), has been among the most thoroughly analysed of the stories Jesus told, before the sixteenth century as after it; cf Fitzmyer AB Luke 1083–6. Erasmus' usual representatives of traditional exegesis – Cyril and Theophylact; Ambrose and Bede; the *Gloss*, Hugh of St Cher, the *Catena aurea*, and Nicholas of Lyra – continue to offer him basic strands of interpretation in their running commentaries, but some further sources with which he was familiar need to be

goes like this: 'A certain man,' he said, 'had two sons. The one of them who was the second born, letting himself be guided by youth and foolishness,[15] went to his father and said, "Father, give me the share of the assets that is coming to me, for I would like to see in my own way what gain I can make

* * * * *

taken into account: the letter of Jerome to Damasus, Ep 21, the subject of which is explication of this parable; the part of Augustine's *Quaestiones evangeliorum* on the parable (2.33), more detailed than many other parts of that work; and a work falsely attributed to Chrysostom, the *Homilia de filio prodigo* PG 59 515–22 (excerpted in the *Catena aurea* on 15:13).

Much of this commentary on the parable is in agreement about significant features of its interpretation, agreement reflected in Erasmus' paraphrase. The points of consensus will be summarized here rather than repetitively cited in notes, and the reader's attention in the following notes directed additionally to instances in which Erasmus' amplification finds precedent in one or a few, or none, of his usual sources.

The first point of agreement is the general application mentioned here, to any notorious sinner and (though Erasmus does not explicitly say so) any righteous believer inclined to begrudge a penitent's reception. The Latin tradition, joined by Theophylact, also applies the parable specifically to the differing responses of Jews and gentiles to Jesus' gospel and act of redemption; such interpretation introduces discussion of the parable, as it does here, and is also found when the hired servants at verse 17 and especially the elder brother in verses 25–32 are mentioned. Cyril mentions such an interpretation only to reject it; Pseudo-Chrysostom does not mention it at all. On the other hand, Augustine in the *Quaestiones evangeliorum*, followed by Bede and the *Gloss*, puts most stress on the application to the Jews. The Latin and Greek commentators also generally agree that the 'share of the assets' handed over to and then squandered by the younger son represents the endowments of all human beings, including life, reason, and free will; that his removal to a foreign country stands not for physical separation from God, which is impossible, but an ethical, emotional, and spiritual one; that the citizen to whom he enslaves himself is Satan or one of his demons; that the husks for pigs are the unsatisfying pleasures of the world; and that the young man starves for want of the solid spiritual food provided by his divine Father. The Latin commentators tend to view the hired servants as the Jews, who keep the Law out of desire for a present reward only. The whole tradition mainly agrees that the garment brought to the young man is the restoration of his baptismal or creational innocence; that the fatted calf is the sacrificed Christ whose body is eaten at the Eucharistic feast; that the singing and dancing heard by the elder son stand for the rejoicing of the church; and that the father's invitation to the elder son represents the calling of the Jews to join with the church of the gentiles.

15 Pseudo-Chrysostom *Homilia de filio prodigo* PG 59 517 also explains the son's decision to leave his father by his youthful impulsiveness. Erasmus returns to the motif in the paraphrase on verse 32 below.

on it."[16] The doting father divided his property between his two sons, and to each one was given his share with the capacity to use it as he wished, though not without hope of increase. And the older one did not remove himself far from the paternal home. But the younger one sold up everything in a few days, gathered together the cash on hand, and journeyed into a distant land.

'What would a young man do, independent and removed from his father and living abroad? He who makes himself the world's stranger divorces himself from God, his most kindly father.[17] This is a separation not of places but of affections. Bad company ruins good morals.[18] The Jewish people had received a Law by whose guidance they might know what to follow and what to flee. Even the people of the gentiles had their gifts, the power of mind, the knowledge of the created universe, from which they could have come to know its creator, as indeed they did. Why, they even produced whole books on the method of right living, though unmindful of the fact that they owed these very riches to the kindness of the Father; and he did not lavish his gifts so that they could foolishly misuse them, but so that from them they could worship their kindly parent, and by worshipping him invite him to more liberal bounty. But how far they had wandered from God, since they worshipped wood and stones, dogs, cows, apes, ser-

* * * * *

16 In 'share of the assets' (*portionem facultatum*) Erasmus substitutes *facultatum*, which can mean both 'material assets' and 'capacities,' for the Vulgate's *substantiae* 'property.' He and the Vulgate use *substantia* again in the sentence describing the father's acceding to the son's request. But as Erasmus had pointed out in the annotation *substantiam* (on 15:12), the Greek text used two different, though synonymous, words, οὐσία and βίος. Here he reflects the variation in the Greek by varying his choice of Latin words, as Jerome had done in Ep 21.9–10. 'That is coming to me' is *quae redit ad me;* in the annotation *quae me contingit* (on 15:12) Erasmus had preferred this expression to the Vulgate's *quae me contingit* 'that falls to me' for τὸ ἐπιβάλλον.

17 For Erasmus' expression 'the world's stranger' (*advenam mundi*) cf Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1847A, who says that one who separates himself from Christ is an exile from his native land and is the world's citizen; paraphrasing Eph 2:19 he says 'we are not strangers [*advenae*] and travellers' – not a claim of cosmopolitanism but an assertion of subjection to the worldly and alienation from the divine. The same passage of Ambrose also parallels the language of divorce in 'divorces himself' (*divortium facit*). *Divortium* in Latin means separation in general, not just a marital separation, as Erasmus has occasion to point out, eg in *Supputatio* LB IX 573E.

18 A word-for-word quotation of *Adagia* I x 74; cf n2 above.

pents, onions, and leeks as gods![19] How they had fallen into those degradations from which natural feeling removes even the dumb beasts!

'What is more, freedom that is not guided by a father's presence is fruitless. For what happened to the emancipated youth?[20] He squandered all the property among strangers – not his own property, since he had nothing of his own, but his father's. And he squandered it by extravagant living: gambling, whores, banquets. For extravagance is whatever is expended on the desires of the flesh that goes beyond necessity.[21] These desires of

* * * * *

19 The function of the law of Moses as a guide to the Jews for the discernment of right and wrong is a chief part of Paul's argument in the Epistle to the Romans; Paul also asserts that the gentiles possessed reason, with which they might deduce the creator from study of his creation, though they turned to the idolatrous worship of created things. Cf eg Rom 1–2. Jerome Ep 21.10 includes in his explication of verse 14 a similar statement of God's gift of reason to the gentiles and its misuse in idolatry. Idolatry as a form of wasting one's natural gifts appears also in Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.33.1 and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 949D–952A. There is warrant for the list of the objects of idol-worship from such biblical sources as Isa 37:19 and 44:9–20, Acts 17:29, and Rom 1:23. Even among the pagan ancients, philosophers in particular, there was widespread amazement at, and often mockery of, forms of gods among peoples known to them, eg: for animal worship cf Herodotus 3.28, Cicero *De natura deorum* 1.81–2 and 3.47, Strabo *Geography* 17.40, Pliny *Naturalis historia* 8.184, Juvenal 15:1–9, and Lucian of Samosata *Juppiter Tragoedus* and *Deorum Concilium*; for the Egyptians' worship of garlic and onions cf Pliny *Naturalis historia* 19.101. The theme was vastly elaborated by Christian apologists, eg in Origen *Contra Celsum* and Eusebius *Praeparatio evangelica*. Erasmus is partial to such ridiculing lists of idols; see eg his paraphrase on 19:1 and n1 below, on John 1:10 CWE 46 20 and n57, and his sermon on Psalm 4 CWE 63 180–1 and n26.

20 *iuveni emancipato*. Erasmus describes the young man by a term drawn from Roman law; 'emancipation' is the legal release from *patria potestas*, the lifelong power of fathers over children that is a unique feature of the Roman legal code. See eg the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* under *emancipatio*.

21 For 'extravagant living' and 'extravagance' Erasmus uses the term *luxus*, an alternative for *luxuria* 'lust,' one of the familiar seven deadly (or capital, or cardinal) sins. He may be inclined to do so by the Christian narrowing of *luxuria* to a focus on sexual sin, not its primary use in classical Latin. See eg Thomas Aquinas *Summa theologiae* II–II qu 153 art 1, where, after a quick assertion that *luxuria* chiefly, not exclusively, denotes sexual sin, Thomas discusses only the sexual sins associated with it. In the annotation *vivendo luxuriose* (on 15:13) Erasmus says that Paul calls *luxus* ἀσωτία 'profligacy' and quotes Eph 5:18, *vinum in quo est luxuria*, making an implicit equation between the two terms; he then adds 'but it does not pertain only to sexual desire (*libido*).'

course corrupt and spoil the natural endowments, however distinguished. But when the young man had wasted[22] all his property, obeying his own whim in everything, a great famine arose in the country in which he was a sojourner. For this world has nothing that can satisfy the human heart except the highest good, which exists only in the father's house. What was a young man to do, a sojourner among strangers, naked and in danger of starving? He who had found it hard to obey the behests of a most merciful father was forced to surrender himself into slavery, to a citizen of a foreign country and a barbarian. When people refuse to accept the easy yoke of the Lord, they are forced to bear the harsh yoke of Satan.[23]

'But do you want to hear how wretched a slavery it is to be a slave to worldly desires? That citizen sent him to his country place, there to feed his pigs. From what high rank to what great disgrace the poor young man had sunk by his own foolishness! From being the heir of a very wealthy house he turned into a slave and a keeper of pigs. And that cruel master did not even give him anything to eat. Why go on? So great was his hunger for truth and divine grace, which alone satisfies the human heart, that he was eager to fill his belly with anything at all, even the husks on which pigs are fattened. And there was no one to give him even that food, so that now he was unhappier than the very pigs, of which he was more truly a slave than a master. Now the very gifts of nature had abandoned the young man. His freedom of choice was completely gone, yet the thoroughly corrupted hungry gnawing of his heart kept on demanding something to eat. All the world's empty pleasures, charming for a little while but neither filling nor fattening the soul, amount to husks for pigs.[24] Demons delight

* * * * *

22 'Wasted' (*profudisset*) here and 'squandered' (*prodegit*) twice just above are Erasmus' paraphrases for the Vulgate *consummasset*, which in classical Latin means 'add together,' 'perfect,' 'complete.' In the annotation *et postquam omnia consummasset* (on 15:14) he says he thinks this word must be a copyist's mistake, though it is found in all the Latin manuscripts he knows. The correct translation of the Greek, he says, would have been *consumpsisset* or *absumpsisset* 'used up' and indeed he found *consumpsit* in Ambrose (see *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1847B; Jerome Ep 21.10 cites the text with *consumpsisset*). The paraphrase uses words that clearly mean the same as the Greek, with no accommodation such as Erasmus so often makes to the familiar language of the Vulgate.

23 'The easy yoke of the Lord' alludes to Matt 11:30; Jerome Ep 21.12–13 notes that the young man becomes the slave of the foreigner and describes Satan putting his own yoke on the sinner. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 523A says the youth is yoked to worldly goods by cupidity.

24 While the exegetical tradition as a whole assigns the symbolic value of the husks to material and sensual pleasures, Erasmus avoids introducing into his

in such things, and with them they more truly tease than fill those in their power. Nor is there always a ready supply of them; or if there is, it is considerably spoiled by the gall of sorrows.

'So now the ultimate calamity had been reached – but happy the calamity that drives one to repentance! This is indeed the first step to salvation, to remember from what a height you have fallen and to recognize how low you have sunk. And this was his father's pull on him.[25] He was certainly far away from his father; but the Father is nowhere not present. The young man had earlier been out of his wits, bewitched by the illusions of this world, running away from the only things he should have been pursuing and pursuing the only things he should have fled. But all is well when, at the secret inspiration of his kindly Father, a sinner returns to his senses.

'So the young man at length came to himself and said, "Wretch that I am, where did I come from and what have I come to? From my own country to exile; from my rich home to a land of famine; from freedom to slavery; from a loving father to a cruel master; from my rank as my father's son to this debased state; from the company of my brother and my household to pigs! How many hired servants there are in my father's house[26] who by my father's kindness are amply supplied with bread! And

* * * * *

paraphrase an interpretation made and elaborated on with some vehemence by Jerome Ep 21.13: 'the songs of poets, worldly wisdom, the pomp of rhetorical speech.' For Jerome's well-known Christian suspicion of the pagan rhetorical and literary arts and Erasmus' view of it, see Jerome Ep 22.30 (also found in CWE 61 174) and Erasmus' biographical essay on Jerome CWE 61 25–35. Jerome's interpretation is paralleled in a much simplified form by Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.33.1, followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 523A–B and the *Gloss* (on 15:16).

25 This is what Erasmus, in the year after the composition of the *Paraphrase on Luke*, would label an example of prevenient grace. In *De libero arbitrio* (1524) he reviews the kinds of grace as they appear in the story of the prodigal son. Part of his comment says, 'What does the famine mean? An affliction by which God arouses the sinner's mind to self-recognition and self-hate, and affects him with a longing for the father he has left. And the son talking to himself, pondering the possibility of confessing his sin and going home? The human will working together with the stimulating grace known ... as "prevenient" grace' (CWE 76 72).

26 *quam multi sunt mercenarii in domo patris mei.* In the annotation *quanti mercennarii* (on 15:17) Erasmus had noted that better Latin for the Vulgate's *quanti* would be *quot* or *quam multi*, an improvement he makes here. He observes in the same annotation that *in domo* 'in the house' does not translate anything in the Greek but is an addition made by some overzealous person to balance the adverb 'here' in the next sentence; he keeps it, however, in the paraphrase.

I his son am starving to death here."[27] The hired servants are most of the Jews, who do indeed keep the commandments of the Law in one way or another, not out of a feeling of devotion but because of fear or for temporal reward. But it is still something to live in the household of so wealthy and so generous a father, even for wages, and not to be torn from a happy home. For the hired servant will turn into a son if he takes on a son's disposition of mind.[28]

'Blessed is the jealousy that provokes a young man to the hope of pardon. For after he bewailed the wretched state in which he lay prostrate, he began to pick himself up,[29] saying, "I shall rise and go to my father. But with what expectation? Do you have any way to clear yourself with him? You took advantage of his fatherly affection, you demanded your share of the assets, and he did not say no. Of your own free will you left him, loving and well disposed as he was; you disgracefully wasted your father's substance, not given to you for that purpose. You have no one to blame for your calamity except your very own self. There is no refuge in defending what I did.

* * * * *

27 Pseudo-Chrysostom *Homilia de filio prodigo* PG 59 517, commenting on the beginning of verse 17, describes the prodigal as comparing his previous and present states, 'who he was when he was with his God and father and who he became in subjection to demons,' and then continues with a series of first-person exclamations and rhetorical questions by which the prodigal compares his former happiness and present misery. Hugh of St Cher (on 15:17) 224v gives an analytical expansion of how this passage portrays the process of returning to God: 'First there is the return to oneself, then the perception of one's failing and the abundance of others, and then the hastening to the father; and then the father comes to meet [the penitent]. The sinner returns to himself when he begins to think about himself and consider the state in which he now is and in which he had been.' Erasmus, like Pseudo-Chrysostom, prefers to dramatize the process.

28 Hugh of St Cher (on 15:18–19) 225r says that the difference among slaves, hired servants, and sons is the reason for which each serves (out of fear, with an eye to wages, and out of love, respectively), but the Lord makes slaves into hired servants and them into sons. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1850C also notes that moving from one level up to another is possible, citing John 15:14–15, though he explains the initial distinctions somewhat differently.

29 Jerome Ep 21.15, Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.33.2 (very tersely), and Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 523D all comment on 'I will rise' at the beginning of verse 18, taking lying down to be the mark of sinners and standing upright the mark of the righteous. Hugh of St Cher (on 15:18) 225r says that 'rising' means lifting one's mind to heavenly things.

'"There is only one hope: since I know my father truly is a father, by nature merciful and willing to answer pleas, perhaps something of his former love still remains in his heart even though I have completely shed my place as his son. I shall not make light of, I shall not deny the wrong I have done. Frank confession and a heart that is truly displeased with itself will carry more weight with him than fussy self-justification. The more frankly I hate myself the more readily will I rekindle his love for me; after all, in the depths of despair to whom am I to entrust myself if not to my father? He alone is able to set me on my feet when I have fallen; if anyone will want to do that, he will. I shall not wait until he learns about my crime and my calamity from others, who will then go on to urge him to avenge himself. It will be more likely to appease him if I myself tell him how matters stand. Let him decide what he wants to do. He is my father, I belong to him, and whatever wrong has been done has been done against him. I shall say to him, 'Father, I have done wrong beyond measure both before the angels of God and before you,[30] and I do not judge myself worthy to be called your son any longer. It will be enough for me if you take pity on me and consider me in the same position as one of your hired servants, as long as I may stay attached to some part of your household.'"[31]

'Surely no plea is better suited to evoking the pity of the best of fathers. The more frankly he confesses a wrongdoing that could not be either hidden or excused, the more intensely he is displeasing to himself, the more he humbles himself, the more he makes it plain that he has no hope except in his father's mercy alone – so much the more he draws his father's heart to his own terms. And it was not art that suggested this form of pleading to the young man,[32] but a conscience completely displeasing to itself to be sure, yet making no mistake about his father's goodness. So having arrived at this degree of confidence, the young man rose. Picking

* * * * *

30 Though the Gospel text makes no mention of angels, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 523D, followed by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 15:18), explains that 'I have sinned against heaven' means 'before the spirits, angels, and holy souls among whom God has his seat.'

31 The elaboration of the monologue in which the prodigal plans his speech of confession is paralleled in Pseudo-Chrysostom *Homilia de filio prodigo* PG 59 518–19; the theme there adopted by the prodigal is complete reliance on his father's paternal affection, which he will invoke by calling him 'father,' and on his forthright admission of wrongdoing.

32 This qualification could be Erasmus' subtle acknowledgment of Jerome's concerns; see n24 above.

oneself up is, as I said, the first step to salvation. He who had left his father in pride and thoughtlessness retraced his whole route weeping and groaning.[33]

'Here you have the portrait of a person repenting of the worst evils. Now, please, look at a picture of divine mercy. The young man had not yet reached his father's dwelling when, while he was still far off, the father caught sight of him coming – such keen eyes does a father's devotion have! The one who loved more tenderly was the more ready to see. And he saw him who had fled in pride and arrogance returning a miserable sight. He saw him in rags, wasted with hunger, filthy, groaning and weeping. The very sight of his condition instantly stirred the father's breast and turned his righteous anger to pity. He ran out to meet the new arrival, and without waiting for his son's pleas, overcome by his natural affection, fell on his son's neck and kissed him. Though these were proofs of a heart prone to forgiveness, the son was still angry with himself and said, "Father, I have done wrong beyond measure both before the angels of God and before you; and yet I make bold to come into your presence though I am unworthy to be called your son hereafter, since I have broken every law of filial duty."

'Here we have the case of a human being who is so devoted to his son from natural instinct; in it learn to understand the goodness of God, who is much more merciful to a sinful human, if only he truly and sincerely repents and is displeasing to himself, than any father can be towards a son he loves most tenderly. The son had not yet said everything he had planned, for a sob interrupted his words. But his tears said more than his speech.[34]

* * * * *

33 There is no mention in the Gospel text of the penitent prodigal weeping. However, Pseudo-Chrysostom *Homilia de filio prodigo* has him remark, as he considers what to say to his father, 'I know how much repentance means to him, I know how much tears can do.' Pseudo-Chrysostom goes on to cite the example of Peter weeping bitterly (Luke 22:62); he also describes the prodigal weeping as he approaches his father and as he addresses him (on verses 20–1), and the father yielding to these tears (on verse 22); see PG 59 517–19. See also n34 below.

34 The Gospel text of verse 21 does not include everything that the prodigal planned to say in verses 18 and 19; it omits his intended request to be one of the hired servants. Pseudo-Chrysostom *Homilia de filio prodigo* PG 59 518 explicates from a text that included this request (as some Greek manuscripts do; see Nestle-Aland on verse 21); Jerome Ep 21.22 and most of the exegetical tradition simply ignore the problem. Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.33.3, followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 524C and the *Gloss* (on 15:17), claims that the prodigal omits the request because his father's kiss gives him reason to disdain the prospect of being merely a hired servant and hope for a return

And now what about the father? Did he thunder forth harsh words? Did he threaten a beating or disowning? Did he reproach the boy with his own kindness towards him, or with the running away, or with the gluttony and the other disgraces of his way of life? He mentioned none of these, so great was his joy at the return of his son. The young man disowns himself; the father restores him. The son condemns himself; the father absolves him. The son humbles himself to the low estate of hired servants; the father restores his original station.

'For turning to the servants he said, "Quick,[35] get out his original robe and dress him in it, and put a ring on his hand and sandals on his feet. And besides that, bring the special fatted calf here from the pasture and kill it. Let us prepare a banquet and rejoice,[36] since this my son was dead and has come back to life; he was lost and is found."

'This is how valuable the truly repentant heart is to God. No punishment is exacted; repentance alone is enough for the loving father. He had made himself unworthy of his father's sight, but he was seen by his father far off when he was still on his way. He had deserved permanent exclusion from his father's house because he had ungratefully and shamefully left it of his own accord; on his return his father, who has no one in his house more merciful than himself, came out to meet him. He had surrendered

* * * * *

to his original position. Erasmus' view of such an interpretation perhaps may be deduced from the concluding sentences of the two paragraphs on 84 below. While the stress put by Pseudo-Chrysostom on the non-scriptural tears of the prodigal (see n33 above) may contribute to Erasmus' solution here, another element is likely to be the scene in Terence *Adelphi* 610–712, where a young man undertakes to make a confession of wrongdoing to his kindly father (who already knows what he has done) but breaks into tears before he can get the words out, 679–80. For Erasmus' high opinion of Terence, see chapter 14 n2 and Ep 2584, the preface to his 1532 edition of Terence for schoolboys.

35 The annotation *cito proferte* (on 15:22) notes that there is nothing in the Greek to correspond to *cito* 'quick,' but Erasmus keeps it here.

36 Erasmus replaces the Vulgate's *epulemur* 'feast' with *gaudeamus* 'rejoice.' In the annotations *et epulemur* (on 15:23) and *et coeperunt epulari* (on 15:24), and again in annotations on 15:29 and 32, Erasmus had reminded the reader that the Vulgate word is not a satisfactory translation of the Greek verb εὐφραίνεσθαι, a point that he, following Valla, had made in an annotation on 12:19. See chapter 12 n19 above. In the paraphrase here and on verses 25, 26, and 32 Erasmus uses a set of Latin terms that mean 'joy' without any connotation of feasting: *gaudere* and *gaudium*, *gratulari* and *gratulatio*, *laetitia*. But in the paraphrase on the elder son's sour reproach in verse 29, he follows the Vulgate and uses *epulari*.

himself as a slave to shameful masters, but his father thought him worthy of his embrace. To one who had earned a beating was given a kiss, the mark of love and peace. Now that is a blessed sinner, whom the Lord thinks worthy of his embrace and kiss! When he has confessed his fault and disclaimed his right to the name of son because of his admitted wrongdoings, all the signs of his original rank are brought out to him. Whatever of his clothing that was suitable for a son was long gone; the best robe of the former innocence that he had lost is brought out to him. Because of his self-imposed servitude every mark of honour that belongs to a son of the house was long gone; his ring is restored to him. And so that no part of his dress should be lacking, even his feet are shod. The young man dared hope for none of these, and the less he hoped for the more he got.

'And so that no one in the house would think less of him as a result of his youthful straying, the father had the calf slaughtered, and invited the whole household to the general celebration, and gave just and proper reasons for his joy: "Whatever he was," he said, "he was my son. He was dead and has come back to life." For sin is the death of the soul. And anyone who deserts the source of his life is hastening towards death. Desertion it surely is whenever anyone loves the things of this world, for his pleasures are far from God's teaching. But one who repents returns to life. He was irrecoverably lost, as far as it lay in his own hands, but he is found. To separate from the household of the father is to be lost; for outside it there is no salvation. And there is no return, unless the father implants himself in the memory of a son reduced to extremes. The recollection is the father's act of kindness; but that the son does not ignore the saving recollection is credited to his account: admission of his wrongdoing is as good as recompense. He had been lost because of his own foolishness, but he was found because of his father's love. And since he repented wholeheartedly, since he was entirely displeased with himself, the father's mercy not only restored him to his former station but also added the banquet, the better to commend his son to the affection of all his people.

'Now pastors and bishops should behave towards the repentant sinner as the father in this parable behaved in welcoming his son. But the haughty Pharisees who make pets of their own faults and deal out nothing but harsh treatment for the failings of others are far from this model.[37] And just here,

* * * * *

37 Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 960B–961C remarks at this point that the third parable, like the first two, is directed specifically at the Pharisees and scribes, who among the Jews are always complaining about the wicked flourishing; the point is, he says, to teach the Pharisees, and through them us, that

while the father's whole house, that is, the entire church of the truly sanctified, echoed with the sounds of general joy and celebration, the pharisaical brother alone was jealous. For while all this was going on the elder son was not at home, but was busy in the field of the Mosaic law, sweating from carrying out the burdens of the commandments and labouring under the weighty works of the Law; and in the meantime his younger brother accepted the gentle yoke of his father.[38] But when he came near his father's house, he heard the unfamiliar noise of people singing and dancing for joy.[39] For fixed on the tasteless letter of the Law, he did not know what a quantity of joys the spirit of the gospel contains. The Jew ignores these joys, doing nothing but digging and hauling in the field of the Law; meanwhile the people of the gentiles is welcomed with great joy into the house of the Father, who thirsts for nothing else but the salvation of all his people.

'But the adherent of the old Law, wondering what strange thing was happening or what was the reason for the unusual rejoicing, did not see fit to go in and be a sharer in the general happiness himself, a thing that the

* * * * *

God accepts sinners and so should we. Hugh of St Cher (on 15:25) 226r comments that Jesus speaks of Jews of different eras and from different perspectives: the worshippers of the one God before Jesus' time; his contemporaries, especially scribes and Pharisees; Jews of Hugh's own day, who study the prophets and have some spiritual understanding; and the Jews of the end-time, who will be converted by the preaching of Elijah and Enoch. Erasmus' tendency to emphasize Pharisees here and to use 'Jews' in the rest of the chapter as if they were almost synonymous with 'Pharisees' may owe something to the comments of Theophylact and Hugh. Cf Hilmar M. Pabel 'Erasmus of Rotterdam and Judaism: A Reexamination in the Light of New Evidence' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 87 (1996) 9–37, who evaluates Erasmus' treatment of Jews in the *Paraphrases*; he discusses the blurring of Pharisees and Jews on 26–7.

38 The Latin exegetical tradition generally at this point takes the elder son's work in the field as standing for laborious observance of Mosaic law; the *Gloss* had described the father's welcome of the younger son as placing the easy yoke of his love upon the youth (on 15:20). See n23 above.

39 *concinentium ac ducentium choreas*. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1853B implies and Jerome Ep 21.29 states that the *symphonia* in verse 25 (in both Latin and Greek) means 'group singing,' not a musical instrument known (at least to Latin-speakers) by that name. Though they do not comment on the Vulgate's *chorus*, by medieval times it meant something like modern English 'chorus' or 'choir'; cf the *Gloss* and Nicholas on 15:25. Pseudo-Chrysostom *Homilia de filio prodigo* PL 59 520, however, paraphrases the noun χορός 'a dance' with the verb χορεύει 'he dances.' Erasmus' annotation *symphoniam et chorum* (on 15:25), besides noting that *symphonia* means 'group singing,' adds that *chorus* here means 'dancing' (*saltationes*).

father very much desired. For gentiles are not welcomed to the exclusion of the Israelites, though even now these latter stand outside the door, filled with resentment because the church rejoices at the reception of the gentiles into gospel salvation. So he called out one of his father's servants and asked him whatever in the world was the strange rejoicing about. The servant replied, "Your brother has come, and your father, rejoicing at his return, has killed the special calf that he had been fattening so long, because the one he thought lost he has welcomed back safe and sound."

'Observe here, please, the truly Jewish heart, which ought to have congratulated his brother on his return and extolled his father's mercy, but preferred to be envious of his brother and resentful of his father! So he stayed outside, grumbling and full of resentment. When his loving father, who wanted the joy of his house to be shared by all, found out, he came out to him and began to ask him gently to put his irritation aside and join the general feasting, and show himself a sharer in his father's joy. The elder son did not soften even at the great kindness of his excellent father; instead he insolently found fault with the father and wickedly attacked the brother. "See here," he said, "I have been your servant all these years, and I never overstepped your commandment, and yet no account has been taken of my long obedience. For you have never given me even a kid so I could feast with my friends. But when that son of yours, who devoured your property[40] with his prostitutes, came home, for him you slaughtered the special fatted calf."

'Can't you picture this older son making his entrance, resentful and grumbling against his father, when you read[41] about the Pharisees criticizing Christ because he eats with tax collectors and sinners? Or about the Jews resenting the Greeks because they were admitted to the apostles' ministry, or complaining because the gentiles coming from idolatry are admitted to the grace of the gospel, granted baptism, and endowed with the Holy Spirit without the burden of the Law, by faith alone?[42] Or about them being jeal-

* * * * *

40 *tuam substantiam.* In the annotation *devoravit substantiam suam* (on 15:30) Erasmus notes that to make the remark more hateful the Greeks and Ambrose [*Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1854A] read *tuam* 'your' where the Latins have *suam* 'his.'

41 LB prints a capital L on *legis,* thus suggesting that the word is the genitive of *lex* 'law' and producing a phrase 'law of the Pharisees'; then the conjunction 'when' lacks a verb. The lifetime texts have the lower-case *legis,* allowing the required 'you read.'

42 The allusion to Jewish resentment of the gospel's being preached to the gentiles appears to refer to eg Acts 15 and Gal 2:1–10, and perhaps to the whole account of the preaching of Paul, beginning in Acts 21:10, especially 22:10. See

ous because, while they themselves stay away from the banquet, the church of the gentiles in unutterable joy of the Spirit eats that remarkable calf that the father has ordered sacrificed for the salvation of the whole world?

'And yet the kindness of his excellent parent endeavours to soothe even this grumbler. "Son," he said, "nothing is taken away from you because I practise mercy towards your brother. For you are always with me, and all that I have is yours. For an unbroken bliss is not so pleasurable; but as a prior illness makes our bodies' health, once regained, most welcome, so his prior downfall has increased our happiness at my son's return. You too ought to congratulate your brother, and not stay away from the celebration of this banquet, because this your brother was dead, and has come to life; he was lost and is found. So do not think that he has come back to you the same; rather, that instead of a wastrel he has been reborn a good man. It is not right to remember what he was, but it is right to rejoice that he is what we wish him to be."'

In these three parables our Lord Jesus urged on his followers mercy and openness in welcoming back sinners. For nowhere is the glory of God made more splendid than when someone who was a notable sinner is suddenly altered by the inspiration of the Spirit and becomes another person: from an idolater a servant of Jesus Christ, from a plunderer of the poor their reliever, from a lustful person a chaste one, from a self-seeking person a self-restrained one, from a vengeful person a tolerant and gentle one. Indeed, the younger son found his father's heart more inclined to pardon precisely because the gentiles who have not known God have sinned more truly out of error than out of intentional malice. For inexperience of affairs and thoughtlessness are the normal accompaniments of youth, and for that reason we more readily pardon this time of life.[43] Indeed, the Jew who

* * * * *

the paraphrases on these passages, for Acts CWE 50 126–51 and for Galatians CWE 42 102–4.

43 This is a common idea, in classical as probably in all times. A few of the most obvious illustrations in classical literature are Aristotle's detailed description of the character type of the young man, marked by impulsiveness, thoughtlessness, and general inexperience, with both faults and virtues arising in consequence, in *Rhetoric* 2.12; the many charming and foolhardy young lovers of Roman comedy, together with the reminders to their fathers that they had committed the same follies when they were young, or would have if they could have afforded it (eg Plautus *Pseudolus* 437–9, Terence *Adelphi* 101–110); and Cicero's speech *Pro Caelio*, which is a defence of a young client largely given over to obfuscation of the jury on the grounds of the natural indulgence granted to young men sowing their wild oats (sections 3–50 and the

thought himself righteous, self-satisfied because he kept the Law, sinned more gravely in being jealous of his brother than the brother sinned in going astray.

Chapter 16

Now the things said so far particularly hit at the Pharisees, who were affronted because our Lord Jesus, as if unmindful of his dignity, admitted tax collectors and sinners to familiar association with him. Next he turned to his disciples and invited them to a more abundant mercy so that they would not only not murmur against the goodness of God but would in every way imitate it themselves, eager to do good to their neighbour at every opportunity, helping him with material assistance, comforting, encouraging, instructing, advising him, forgiving his misdeeds – and at the same time Jesus taught that our kindness will not go to waste but whatever is spent here on our neighbour is stored up on our behalf for the life to come.[1] He expressed this idea in the following parable:

'There was a rich man who had entrusted the management of his affairs to his steward.[2] The steward was reported to his master on grounds

* * * * *

peroration in particular). For the analogy being made between a father's relationship with his righteous and errant sons and God's differing relations with the people of the Law and with the gentiles, cf the paraphrases on verses 2 and 7 above. The contrast is a common theme in the *Paraphrase on Luke*, eg the paraphrase on 12:47 above.

1 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 527D–529A introduces his explanation of chapter 16 with the comment that the two parables in it show that those who expend their earthly goods on acts of mercy for the poor will be received by them in the eternal dwelling-places. He is followed by Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 964D and Nicholas of Lyra (on 16:1); and more broadly by the *Gloss* (on 16:1) and Hugh of St Cher (on 16:1) 227V. The *Gloss* adds that the injunction to acts of mercy specifically means forgiving sins and giving necessities (quoting 6:37b–38). For Erasmus' list of the variety of ways, most of them not material, that assistance may be offered to one's neighbour, see the paraphrase on 14:14. There is an oddly similar list in Sallust's description of Caesar's way of winning political support, *Bellum Catilinae* 54.3: 'Caesar gained glory by giving, helping, forgiving.'

2 In the following parable and its explication Erasmus completely abandons the Vulgate's *villicus* and cognate words for the steward and his functions. Instead he favours either *oeconomus*, the Latin transliteration of οἰκονόμος in the Greek text and the commonest word for 'steward' in the paraphrase on this episode, or *dispensator*, *dispensatio* and related verbs for 'steward,' 'financial agent,' 'stewardship,' 'management.' Jerome Ep 121.6 had pointed out that

of being more freehanded than was acceptable and wasting his master's goods.[3] So the master summoned the steward and said to him, "Why am I hearing this story about you? Hand in the accounts of your management, for I don't want you as steward of my property any longer." Now when the steward realized that in a short time he would be removed from the stewardship, in a short time he looked out for himself quite cleverly. Some people have riches, others learning, others experience, and others still other gifts. But what each one has with which he can do good to his neighbour is the property of a wealthy master, which it behoves him to lay out generously on his neighbour. For no one is owner of the gifts he has, but only a manager. This management is taken away quickly, for all of life here is short, and after this life there is no possibility of doing good service.[4]

* * * * *

a *villicus* in Latin was properly a farm manager but that *οἰκονόμος* means a manager of money and all property for an owner, not just crops and stock; he quotes the entire parable with the substitution of *dispensator* and *dispensatio* for *villicus* and *villicatio*. Jerome's correction is followed in simplified form by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 529D, the *Gloss* (on 16:1), Hugh of St Cher (on 16:1) 227v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 16:1). Valla *Annot in Lucam* 16 gave the Greek for the Vulgate's set of words and cited Jerome's letter as an indication that Jerome was not the translator of the Vulgate NT, since he disagreed with the choice of words that appears there; Valla substantiated Jerome's objection by quoting the definition of *villicus* in Varro *De re rustica* 1.2.14, along with a long quotation from Jerome himself that mentions Xenophon's *Oeconomus* and Cicero's explanation of its title. In the annotations *qui habebat villicum* (on 16:1) and *redde rationem villicationis tuae et Non poteris amplius villicare* (on 16:1–2) Erasmus repeated all that Valla had said, altering only a bit of the language and omitting the allusion to Jerome's not being the translator of the Vulgate NT. (This last is a point he well understood; see Jerome's preface to the Gospels, still printed in modern Vulgate Bibles, where Jerome explains that he corrected but did not retranslate the NT, and Erasmus Ep 182:168–71.) *Oeconomus* was also a common term in the early church for the financial manager, bursar, or steward of a chapter or religious community; see the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* and Jerome Ep 22.35

3 *delatus est quod ... dissiparet* 'he was reported on grounds of ... wasting.' In the annotation *diffamatus est* (on 16:1) Erasmus had taken exception to the Vulgate's *diffamatus est* 'he was maligned' and said that *delatus est* 'he was accused [to someone in authority]' was a better translation of the Greek because it expressed an accusation that could be either true or false, not only a false one. He also proposed, instead of the Vulgate's *quasi dissipasset* 'as if he were wasting,' an expression that would more clearly convey the content of a charge instead of a calumny. Here he adopts both his own suggestions.

4 Erasmus anticipates his fuller treatment of the same themes in the paraphrase on verses 8–13 below. The exegetical tradition on both parables agrees that wealth is given by God to our stewardship for the benefit of others, not

Furthermore, whoever spends what he has on his own desires and does not use it to assist his neighbour is squandering his master's resources.

'Well, then – the steward who was about to be removed from his stewardship thought it over with himself, saying, "What am I going to do now that my master is taking the management of his property away from me? I have no means of support. For I did not put anything aside for myself while I could. The only choices are to dig in the fields for day wages or to be a public beggar. I haven't the strength for digging; I am ashamed to beg. But a good idea has just occurred to me about how I may look out for myself right away: I will get myself friends by way of my master's resources. Then when I have been removed from my position as steward they will remember my kindness towards them and welcome me into their homes." So, summoning his master's debtors one by one, he said to the first, "How much do you owe my master?" The other answered, "A hundred jars[5] of oil." The steward said, "Take your bond, sit down, and write fifty instead of a hundred, quick. My master is very rich; I want you to be the gainer by half, thanks to me." When that was done he said to the next one, "And you, how much do you owe?" "A hundred measures of wheat," was the answer. The steward said, "Take your note[6] and write eighty. The master will not

* * * * *

ourselves; the opportunity to spend it exists only in this life. See Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1854C, Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.35, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 809A–816B (also in the *Catena aurea* on 16:9–13), Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 530D–531C, the *Gloss* (on 16:9), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 964D–965A, and Hugh of St Cher (on 16:9–11) 228v. Augustine, Bede, the *Gloss*, Hugh of St Cher, and Nicholas of Lyra divide wealth into money, usually described as external or worldly, and endowments of heart and mind (as also in the parable of the prodigal son) or the spiritual gifts of the gospel, which will survive death if they are rightly used on earth.

5 *batos*. In the annotation *centum cados* (on 16:6) Erasmus reports that the Greek text uses a Hebrew word for a liquid measure, *βάτος*, which means seventy-two Roman *sextarii*, according to Josephus *Jewish Antiquities* (at 8.57); here he replaces the Vulgate with the Hebrew/Greek term. In the same annotation he explains the Hebrew dry measure *coros* 'measures' in the Greek and Vulgate of verse 7 as equivalent to forty-one Attic *medimni*, again citing the *Jewish Antiquities* (at 3.321); he keeps that word in his paraphrase. Estimates of modern equivalents vary; see Fitzmyer AB Luke on verses 6 and 7 and the table of weights and measures in the *Oxford Companion to the Bible* ed Bruce M. Metzger and Michael D. Coogan (New York and Oxford 1993) 796–7.

6 *codicillos tuos*. The Vulgate text of verse 7 has *litteras tuas*, but in the annotation *accipe cautionem* (on 16:6) Erasmus had elaborated on a point made by Valla *Annot in Lucam* 16, that the Greek text in verses 6 and 7 uses *γράμμα*, which should have been translated by the same Latin word in both places; the trans-

notice that twenty measures are gone, but you are a poor man and they will be a help to you." He dealt with the other debtors in the same way.'

If the rich man had found out about the deceit, the steward would not have gotten away with it; even so, our Lord Jesus praised the deceitful yet foresighted plan of the steward to his disciples as a model of generosity,[7] and he urged his followers to the imitation of it, rebuking our indolence because the people who are slaves to this world are more foresighted and alert in looking out for their body's welfare than are those who, in looking out for their life in heaven, have renounced the world and pursue things eternal. It is disgraceful that the former group are wise in their kind and foresighted when it is a question of trivial and transient matters, while we are slack in providing for ourselves the resources of immortal life by offering our services to our neighbour, when in fact, because of the uncertainty of the end of this life, everyone ought to be prepared to hear from his master what the steward heard: you cannot be my steward any longer. But since everyone's time is uncertain and in any case no one's is long, we must make haste to lay out our earthly possessions for the poor and thus provide ourselves with passage to eternal life. For the result will be that we ourselves will be made sharers in the benefits that others have won if we have aided them with our riches. Indeed, whoever uses his property to aid one engaged in the gospel's business will in his turn be helped in the kingdom of heaven by the gospel preacher's kind acts.[8]

* * * * *

lation both times should have been *cautio* or *scriptum* 'document,' *syngrapha* 'a (written) bond,' *codicilli* 'note,' *libelli* 'ledger,' or some such word. Jerome Ep 121.6 had used *cautio* in both places; see n2 above. All these terms are from the language of Roman commercial transactions.

For all his language of commerce and accounting in this section, Erasmus, along with the tradition before him and exegesis since, takes it for granted that the reduction of the debtors' bills is an instance of the dishonesty for which the steward is being let go. But see Fitzmyer AB Luke 1096–1101 on the parable, who reports a modern interpretation that the original notes were for not just the loans but also the steward's commission on the transactions, a common arrangement in the Greco-Roman world, and that the latter is what he writes off.

7 The usual exegetical tradition takes the 'lord' who in verse 8 praises the steward's action to be the steward's employer. Erasmus makes him the Lord Jesus, the teller of the parable. For discussion and bibliography on this interpretation, see Fitzmyer AB Luke 1095–1101.

8 Here and at the end of the next paragraph Erasmus takes the 'friends' of verse 9 to be not only the poor but in particular those who have chosen poverty as

So the Lord said, 'Take timely thought for your own selves on the model of the provident steward. Win for yourselves good friends from a bad thing, so that when at the master's bidding you are compelled to depart from your bodily domicile,[9] those friends may welcome you to the eternal dwelling-places.'

It is a happy exchange when perishable things are changed for eternal ones. And what is more worthless or further from excellence than the wealth of this world? It is scarcely ever gotten without deceit, and the method of protecting and increasing it is no different from the method of getting it.[10] Its possession is burdensome, and never secure or at all long-lasting. For it does not follow its owner when he passes from this place. Yet with it one can purchase what is eternal and will be a help in the life to come. So the very thing that when it is stored away[11] makes a person unjust and in bondage to many worries will when it is spent become the instrument

* * * * *

part of a commitment to preaching the gospel. The same particular application to servants of God is made by Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 113 PL 38 648, the *Gloss* (on 16:9), and Hugh of St Cher (on 16:4) 228r. A more general view is that 'friends' means the poor of any sort, though Augustine in *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.34.1 specifies that the poor are the righteous and holy, while Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1854C, followed by Hugh of St Cher (on 16:9) 228v, speaks of saints and angels.

9 Erasmus' 'when ... you are compelled to depart from your bodily domicile' paraphrases the Vulgate *cum defeceritis* 'you fail,' based on a Greek reading found in the patristic tradition, ἐκλίπητε 'you give out.' Modern texts read a third-person singular verb in the Greek, 'when it [unrighteous mammon] fails.' See Fitzmyer AB Luke 1110.

10 The idea that material wealth is likely to have been gained by fraud or wrongdoing is mentioned here by Jerome Ep 121.6, the *Gloss* (on 16:9), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 16:9), based on Jerome's definition of *mammon* as a Syrian term for wealth; Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 113 PL 38 648 has a similar explanation. Nicholas also cites Ambrose (cf *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1854C) for the inducement to sin presented by possession of wealth. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 530D and Hugh of St Cher (on 16:9) 228v also define *mammon* as 'wealth,' though Hugh includes spiritual wealth, ie knowledge and power wrongfully possessed, as well. Erasmus does not have the word *mammon* in the paraphrase on verse 9, though it appears in the Gospel text and he will use it in the paraphrase on verses 11 and 13. Instead he says 'win for yourselves good friends from a bad thing' (*ex re mala*); among the many uses of the word *res* in Latin is its application to wealth. He otherwise has a number of terms relating to money and financial matters.

11 *reconditum*, perhaps an echo of the parable of the man who plans to store up his harvest in new granaries, 12:16–21, where Erasmus' paraphrase uses forms of the verb *recondere* 'store away' several times

of gospel righteousness, while the servant of the gospel is assisted in his necessities and at the same time the value returns to the giver with much interest.

One who has the management of wealth that belongs to a human being is accounted a faithful steward only if he disburses what is entrusted to him as sparingly as possible. In contrast, God, who is wealthy towards all, wants what he has handed over for stewardship to be laid out quite lavishly; and he considers anyone an untrustworthy steward who treats as his own what the Lord wished to be shared when a neighbour's need requires. So if anyone conducts himself in the management of worthless material goods otherwise than in accordance with the wishes of so generous a master, will he not seem unworthy of being entrusted by his master with the management of higher things? Whatever we have is the Lord's; material wealth and all that this world brings forth is the kindness of God. The gospel teaching and the other endowments of the Spirit are God's gifts. They are not given for us to enjoy by ourselves but so that we may disburse them for our neighbour's use. But there is this distinction: the things that concern the restoration of the body, since they are external to us, are neither our own nor permanent; they are the world's wealth rather than ours. Then, since they give the appearance of happiness according to the world's standards, though in fact they strongly oppose true human happiness, they are not really what they are called. For they are called goods when they really are things that make a person unhappy. Therefore the riches of the heart are real and really ours; not because we do not owe them to God but because they will not abandon their possessor even in the life to come, provided that one uses them now as they ought to be used.

Further, in the state no one is advanced to the consulship unless he has first given evidence of his soundness in the aedileship or praetorship or other lesser posts,[12] and in the household stewardship over valuables

* * * * *

12 The paraphrase sketches the main stages of the *cursus honorum* or constitutionally established sequence by which under the Roman republic and empire men rose through the elective offices until they reached the highest elected post, the consulship. At least under the republic, consuls were supreme commanders in the field and the chief executives of civilian government; praetors were second only to consuls as generals, or might have administrative oversight of the judicial system; aediles oversaw a variety of administrative functions usually related to some aspect of public finance. The sequence and titles continued to exist under the empire, though in many respects the functions changed. See the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* under *cursus honorum* and the individual offices.

is entrusted to none except one who has first shown himself faithful in little things. Just so the Lord teaches that stewardship of the gospel riches, which are really and truly wealth, is not to be entrusted to one who has less than faithfully distributed money, the least important of all things and also not really his own. For whoever cannot treat earthly riches with scorn will distribute the riches of the heart dishonestly.

Impressing these things on the hearts of his disciples the Lord said, 'One who is faithful in what is very little, it is agreed, will also be faithful in a matter of importance. Again, one who is unjust in a triviality will be also unjust in a serious issue. For anyone whose heart can be enticed to sin by concern over a quite insignificant thing will be much more easily drawn to sin by a more important circumstance. But if in unrighteous mammon, that is to say, in riches, themselves deceitful and, as is usually the case, obtained by deceit, you do not show yourselves faithful to the master who gave them to you to distribute, who will entrust the true riches of the heart to you? And if you have been less than faithful in property not your own, which cannot be anyone's permanently, who will commend to your care that which would have been forever yours? The one who mismanages the wealth of this world does less harm than the one who mismanages the riches of the gospel.

'The kingdom of God demands the whole of a person. It demands a heart free from love of all worldly goods. And there is no reason for anyone to try to combine the world with the gospel, that is, with the kingdom of heaven. For if no one can be a servant shared between two masters – because there would scarcely be such agreement between any mortals that the one servant would be able to satisfy both of them with his services; he would scorn the one and be compelled to attach himself to the other – how much less are you able to serve God and mammon, masters at such cross purposes that there is no agreement between them? One who puts the greater part of happiness in wealth, and on that account labours with great zeal to possess as much as possible and to protect and increase his yield, is a slave to mammon. He is delighted when his property grows and in anguish when it is snatched away. The servant of God is the one who has either renounced the goods of this world or is indifferent to his possession of them and who cares most zealously for the things that make for eternal salvation.'[13]

* * * * *

13 The theme of enslavement to wealth or mammon is emphasized by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1854B and Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 532A. For indifference to wealth, see Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.34.2; for renunciation of wealth, the *Gloss* (on 16:9–12).

This entire discourse, though addressed to those who thought that though burdened with anxiety about riches they could still be disciples of Christ, was also heard by the Pharisees, whose hearts like old wineskins could not hold the new wine of the gospel teaching.[14] For they were greedy not just for money but for glory too. They were haughty, arrogant, and vengeful. So they mocked our Lord Jesus' teaching that called them to good deeds and to disregard of revenge, of glory, and even of life. This world has and always will have its Pharisees, who rely on their own resources and mock the teaching of humility, mercy, gentleness, and generosity. The palate accustomed to the stale wine of worldly wisdom shrinks from this celestial new wine. Oh, that our Lord Jesus would see fit to deliver a blow to the derisive grimaces[15] of these modern Pharisees too, as he sharply refuted the ones who were deriding him, saying, 'You are swollen with pride in your lifeless images of good things, flaunting yourselves among people who value a person by his opulence, his dress, his observance of rituals, from all of which you even get yourselves praise for your holiness, though in reality you are neither rich nor holy nor happy nor important. For God, who alone looks into your hearts, values a person by the actual good things in his heart. And after all, the rich person is the one who is rich in God's sight; the righteous one is the one who is righteous in God's

* * * * *

14 For old wineskins and new wine see 5:37 and its synoptic parallels; for those who cling to old wine (in the paraphrase just below) 5:39.
This sentence distinguishes between two groups of listeners: those rich people who thought they could be followers of Christ though anxious about their wealth, and also the Pharisees, greedy, as the next sentence says, both for wealth and for glory. In the annotation *audiebant autem haec omnia Pharisaei, qui erant avari, et deridebant eum* (on 16:14) Erasmus had said that the Greek text includes a καί 'and' before 'the Pharisees,' and so the sentence is saying that of all the listeners only the Pharisees took offence; he paraphrases accordingly. The καί is found in some manuscript families but is not admitted in modern texts; see the apparatus in Nestle-Aland. As for the twin objects of the Pharisees' greed, glory and wealth, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 817B also says they are lovers of glory though they do not really deserve it.

15 'Derisive grimaces' is *sannas*. The Vulgate text of verse 14 says that the Pharisees 'derided' him, *deridebant*, the same word Erasmus had used in paraphrasing the verse twice just above. Here he amplifies its meaning by using a rare word, *sannae*, that in classical Latin is found in the satirists Persius *Satires* 1.62 and 5.91 and Juvenal *Satires* 6.306. Jerome had used an equally rare late Latin verb from this noun in paraphrasing the same verse: *adversum se dictam intelligentes parabolam subsannabant eum* 'understanding that the parable was directed against them they made derisive grimaces at him' (Ep 121.6).

sight; the great one is the one who is of little importance to himself but great in God's judgment. For generally speaking what seems to mortals sublime and worth looking up to is execrable in God's eyes.

'You still have your teeth in the hull of the Law and take pride in shadows; yet now the kernel must be disclosed so that the risen light of gospel truth may scatter the shadows.[16] You must be weaned from the stale wine of the Mosaic law and drink the new wine of more powerful teaching. The figures of the Law have had their time; what the oracles of the prophets promised was long awaited. But figures cease after the truth appears, and the prophets' promise is no longer awaited now that what they had promised is revealed. It is necessary to advance from shadows to truth; there must be an advance from faith in the promises to love for the actuality now revealed. John was the dividing-line, separating the Law with its figures and the prophets with their promises from the gospel, which reveals in reality both what the Law had sketched out in its shadows and what the prophets inspired by God had foretold would come. John preached that the kingdom of God is at hand. This is in fact what the Law foreshadowed, this is what the prophets foresaw.

'And indeed you see that the actuality matches John's prophecy. For since his time[17] the kingdom of God is being announced to everyone, and many are seizing on the happy news with joyful hearts. They are drinking the new wine, they are draining the cup of heavenly teaching; they scorn earthly goods and grow rich in heavenly ones. They cast away money but produce miracles; they have no weapons but put diseases to flight. They hold no public offices, but they expel demons. They are not rich, mighty, and full of glory in the world's sense, but before God they are truly wealthy, mighty, and glorious in humility, gentleness, patience, kindness, and the other good things of the heart. No one is excluded from entry to this bliss. But if you Pharisees do not see fit to enter, others will take your places; the gentiles will enter, peoples from all over the world will enter. Once the door is opened they cannot be kept out; if they are not admitted they break

* * * * *

16 For the familiar scriptural image of divine light rising to scatter the shadows, see 1:79, Isa 9:2, and the parallels to these passages listed in biblical concordances.

17 *ab hujus enim tempore.* In the annotation *ex eo* (on 16:14), Erasmus had noted that a better way to say 'from then' in Latin would be *ex tunc*, quoting the phrase from a psalm (92:2 Vulg), or better *ex eo tempore* or *ab eo tempore* 'from' (or 'since') 'that time.' The paraphrase is in line with this observation.

in by force. You see tax collectors, soldiers, sinners, prostitutes running up. Spurning all their possessions, scorning all the pleasures of this world, relying on the gospel promises, they wholeheartedly desire the heart's true good; and while you, who ought to have entered first and brought in other aspirants, stand outside, they burst in willy-nilly in their passion of belief and readiness of heart. And the kingdom of God loves this kind of violence.[18]

'And there is no reason why the lovers of the Law should cry out in protest that the Law is being repealed and the prophets rejected.[19] No, this is not abolition of the Law but its fulfilment.[20] For a mother does not grieve that her son has died when the boy becomes a man. But it is the height of folly to embrace the picture of a person when it is possible to embrace the actual person depicted, and to entreat the maker of a promise when it is possible to possess the thing promised. You must compare reality with its portrayal, and if they match, acknowledge what has been outlined and embrace what has been revealed. If the turn of events matches the promises of the prophets, let go your faith in them and embrace the promise made good. Then if you see that many things have already happened that had been outlined in the shadows of the Law (for the Law is spiritual), if in many matters the outcome of events corresponds to the ancient predictions of the prophets, believe that with like trustworthiness every promise that the Law and the prophets have said would come to pass will someday be fulfilled.

'What was carnal and crude in the Law gives way to more perfect things; what is spiritual, though, is not only not rejected but even perfected. For the Law permits a husband, on delivery of a notice of divorce, to send his wife away and marry another. But according to the gospel Law, whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery. And whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery. For neither man has his own wife and neither woman her husband. Both natural feeling and gospel

* * * * *

18 The idea that the violence being exerted against the kingdom of God is the blessed violence of eager seekers after gospel righteousness is found in Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1855B–C, followed by the *Gloss* (on 16:16), and in Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 820A–B. See also the paraphrase on John 4:38 CWE 46 60 and n56.

19 *abrogari Legem, antiquari Prophetas.* The paraphrase uses two verbs from the technical vocabulary of Roman constitutional law.

20 *non abolitio sed absolutio,* very nearly a pun in Latin. For the thought, see Matt 5:17.

simplicity demand that affection be a permanent and unbroken link, not just in marriage but in every friendship.[21]

'And there is no reason for anyone to accuse the gospel teaching of being in conflict with the commandments of Moses. Moses indeed, because of your hard-heartedness, did not dare to require what he wished for more than hoped, and he reluctantly indulged you with regard to divorce lest if it were forbidden your hatred would break out in worse crimes.[22] So he who requires what is more perfect does not repeal, he perfects. Just so a father is not at all inconsistent with himself when having been more indulgent of his son in the boy's younger years he later requires more from the grown child than he had earlier.

'But I assure you that, far from my coming to abolish the Law, the longest-lasting things of all, heaven and earth, will pass away more quickly than one tiny jot of the Law will perish without the perfect completion of what has been foretold.'

Now a little earlier our Lord Jesus had used the parable of the clever steward to encourage doing good for the needy so that after this life they may welcome us into the eternal dwellings, because in the complete reversal of all things they will then have an abundance of all kinds of wealth while the rich will be tormented with every kind of ill. Therefore he sketched out a kind of model of this case so it would stick better in human minds.[23] 'There was a very rich man,' he said, 'who seemed to lack nothing for perfect happiness in this world: he was a great name among human beings but before God obscure and unknown.[24] He was dressed both sensually and expensively, in purple and pure silks. And so that nothing would be missing for

* * * * *

21 In this paragraph Erasmus has paraphrased verse 18, thus presenting it as an example of the principle 'not abolition of the Law but its fulfilment'; see the previous paragraph and nn19–20. The view that verse 18 is an example of the way in which Jesus fulfils rather than abolishes the old Law is expressed by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1855C–1858A (who like Erasmus inverts verses 17 and 18 for purposes of his discussion), Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 533B–C, the interlinear *Gloss* (on 16:18), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 969C–973A, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 16:17).

22 The thought is drawn from Matt 19:8.

23 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 533D, followed by the *Gloss* (on 16:19), observes that this story exemplifies the point of the parable at the beginning of chapter 16.

24 The exegetical tradition takes the fact that the rich man is not given a name in this story while the poor man is named as an indication that the former has no standing with God while the latter does; see Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 828A, Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 41 PL 38 249, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 534B–C, and Hugh of St Cher (on 16:20) 230V.

his body's delight, every day he gave a magnificent party, for he was at one and the same time a slave to his ambition, his extravagance, and his pleasure.

'At the same time there was someone far different from this man, a beggar, obscure and unknown among humankind but distinguished and well known before God. Indeed, he had his name from his situation, being called Lazarus, because deprived of all worldly resource he relied on the aid of God alone.[25] He had neither home nor clothing nor food, and not even good physical health. For he was full of sores, as we read Job was.[26] Now he lay at the rich man's door, waiting for something to be sent out to him from the scraps that fell from the rich man's table, so that he could soothe the hungry growling of his stomach. Ridden with sores as he was, he was not let inside, lest the sad sight of him cast a pall in some way on the elegant feast. You note the height of opulence; but in so much luxury and extravagance there was so much stinginess towards a neighbour in distress that not even the scraps were given in response to his request, though the dogs there were well fed on bread.[27] In fact, even the dogs rebuked the inhumanity of the self-indulgent rich man, for they would come and lick Lazarus' sores.[28] Who would not have judged that rich

* * * * *

25 The name 'Lazarus' is said to mean 'helped' in Jerome *De nominibus Hebraicis* CCL 72 140, Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.38.1, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 537B, and a passage attributed to Chrysostom in the *Catena aurea* on 16:19–21. In the annotation *nomine Lazarus* (on 16:20) Erasmus himself had said that it means 'helped by God' in Hebrew, 'so the word itself also is consistent with the parable: he was deserted by humankind but had God as his helper.'

26 See Job 2:7. *ulceribus plenus* 'full of sores' reproduces the wording of the Vulgate text though in the annotation *ulceribus plenus* (on 16:20) Erasmus had suggested two other words that would be better Latin translations for the Greek. He uses one of them, *ulcerosus* 'covered with sores' just below and in the paraphrase on verse 25. Similarly in the annotation *qui iacebat* (on 16:20) he had improvements to suggest for the Vulgate's *iacebat* 'lay,' but the paraphrase in the next sentence here keeps the Vulgate language.

27 This sentence paraphrases a clause found in the Vulgate of Erasmus' day, 'and no one gave to him,' though in the annotation *et nemo illi dabat* (on 16:21) he noted that he found the clause in none of the Greek manuscripts available to him. For the thought of the preceding sentence cf Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1859D–1860A, who says the rich man could not abide the smell of the sick beggar; Ambrose is followed by the *Gloss* (on 16:20). Hugh of St Cher (on 16:20) 231r stresses the rich man's intolerance of the very sight of Lazarus. For the feeding of the dogs on bread from the table, cf the story of the Syrophoenician woman in Matt 15:21–8. It was doubtless also a practice of Erasmus' own day.

28 The behaviour of the dogs is seen as an act of mercy and a rebuke of the rich man's inhumanity by Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 828A, the *Gloss* (on 16:21),

man the perfect picture of happiness, and Lazarus the picture of extreme unhappiness?

'But human happiness is by no means to be gauged by the operations of chance that befall us in this life. Suddenly the situation was reversed. For as death that looms over all puts a stop to all the pleasures of the rich, so is it the end of all suffering for the wretched. It happened that the beggar died, and he who had been neglected by mortals while he lived was carried off in death to the bosom of Abraham by God's angels. God deemed worthy of this honour one whom the rich man did not deem worthy of his roof. But at the very same time the rich man died too. For death alone, which is the common lot of all, teaches the rich that they are mortals like everyone else. And Lazarus did not even have the honour of a burial; but the rich man was carried to the grave in a magnificent funeral procession.[29]

'Now both were among the dead; but the rich man was in grievous torment, and was just as harshly treated there by the lack of earthly delights and the abundance of woes as he had treated himself indulgently in life.[30] At length he raised his eyes and caught sight of Abraham far off, and recognized Lazarus, the man he had once scorned, in Abraham's bosom, enjoying the height of rest and consolation in the gentle embrace of the holy patriarch. For Abraham acknowledged as a son him whom the rich man refused to recognize as a human being. The sight of another's bliss

* * * * *

Hugh of St Cher (on 16:21) 231v, and a passage attributed to Chrysostom in the *Catena aurea* on 16:19–21.

29 The Gospel text says that the rich man died and was buried; Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 41 PL 38 249 concludes from the absence of any mention of burial for Lazarus that he had no funeral. In the annotation *et sepultus est in inferno* (on 16:22–3) Erasmus had corrected the traditional Vulgate punctuation, which had attached *in inferno* 'in the underworld' to 'was buried,' and also had neglected an 'and' marking the division between 'was buried' and 'in the underworld' in the Greek text. The paraphrase says 'both were among the dead' *apud inferos*, taking the *in inferno* of the Gospel text as a post-mortem state that does not correspond to the traditional Christian division into heaven above and hell below but is more like the single underworld with areas of punishment and relative ease found in eg Virgil *Aeneid* 6. Cf Erasmus' introduction of Tartarus, a Greco-Roman poetic term for the underworld, in the paraphrase on verse 25 below.

30 Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1861A observes that for a voluptuary to be without his pleasures is punishment. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 536B–C adds that the wicked dead are further tormented by seeing the joy of the good, an idea Erasmus expresses just below. Bede is followed by the *Gloss* (on 16:24) and Hugh of St Cher (on 16:24) 232v.

increased his suffering. This rich man changed into a wheedling beggar,[31] not that it did him any good, and called out in a pitiable voice, "Father Abraham, have mercy on me and send Lazarus to dip the end of his finger in water so that he can cool my tongue with just one little drop, I am suffering so in this fire."

'Abraham replied, "Son, the refreshment you are now asking for too late is what you ought to have prepared for yourself when you were among the living, by relieving your neighbour.[32] But you were bewitched by the wealth you had then, and did not even see fit to help Lazarus with the crumbs from your table when he was perishing. Recognize that now the circumstances are justly altered. You should recognize it, if you are willing to recall that you got your good things when you were alive, while Lazarus on the other hand finished with his ills in life.[33] Now the situation is reversed: after patiently bearing his afflictions he is being relieved, but you, after the pleasures in which you took unholy delight, are deservedly in torment. You turned your back on him when he was covered with sores; now he is in my embrace, awash in balm, and his whole skin glows.[34] You did not think him worthy of your roof; I think him worthy of my bosom. You relieved him with neither food nor drink when he was in need; now he is restored in eternal rest, which knows no trouble from either hunger or thirst.

* * * * *

31 The rich man's transformation into a beggar is noted here by Hugh of St Cher (on 16:24) 232v; cf also n41 below.

32 Here and three times more in this paragraph and the next Erasmus uses forms of the verb *refocillare* 'relieve,' 'revive.' The word is not classical but a distinctively Vulgate term found in the OT, mostly in reference to relieving thirst and hunger; cf Judg 15:19, 1 Sam 30:12, 2 Sam 16:14, Jth 7:7, Lam 1:11 and 19. But eg in 1 Sam 16:23 David's music is said to 'revive' (*refocillare*) Saul. Erasmus uses the word again in the paraphrase on Acts 3:20; cf CWE 50 29 with n33.

33 The paraphrase adds the pronominal adjectives (*tua*) to 'good things' and (*suis*) to 'ills,' though the Vulgate of Erasmus' day had neither. In the annotation *recepisti bona* (on 16:25) Erasmus pointed out that the Greek text did include a word for 'your,' and went on to say that 'his' must be understood with 'ills,' since the sense is Lazarus' own ills, not just the ills of life in general.

34 'Awash in balm and his whole skin glows' is *delibutus unguento . . . totus nitidus*. Hugh of St Cher (*moraliter* on 16:25) 233r cites here the oil of gladness in Isa 61:3; cf also Ps 23:5. *Nitidus* 'sleek,' 'shining,' 'well groomed' is a favourite word of Horace, where it appears to connote the attractive appearance of skin and hair, both of which the Romans groomed with oil. Cf Horace *Epistles* 1.4.15: *me pinguem et nitidum bene curata cute vises* 'You'll find me plump and glossy, my skin well tended.'

'"And with what brazenness do you now seek refreshment from him who before today got no refreshment from you? If you had clothed him when he was naked, fed him when he was hungry, given him drink when he was thirsty; if you had taken him into your house when he lay before your door, if you had cared for him when he was covered with sores, he would now in turn ask for and receive comfort for you and release from your torments, and would in turn welcome you into this company.[35] You wretch, where are your silks and purple now, your perfumed oils, your dinner parties, your dances, and all your self-serving pleasures? While you lived you sneered at every kind of wine, so great was the refinement of your palate, but you did not give water to a thirsty man. Now you cannot get even a drop of water to relieve the burning of your tongue. Instead of your proud house Tartarus is yours; instead of your pleasures eternal torment; instead of jesting and song endless wailing.[36]

'The misfortune of your kind is the more deplorable because a great gap[37] divides us, so that if anyone should wish to go from here to there and assist you, it is not possible. And if anyone tries to climb up here from there he cannot, once each one's place has been assigned to him by God's unalterable judgment. In life there was time to help one's neighbour and be helped by him in turn, in an exchange of service rendered. Now it is too late to wish for what is impossible here.[38] You wanted to be

* * * * *

35 Cf Matt 25:34–46, a passage also echoed in discussion of this story by Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.38.3, and the story of the good Samaritan, 10:25–37.

36 The exegetical tradition generally contrasts the former and present circumstances of both Lazarus and the rich man, but without enumerating the rich man's habits as particularly as Erasmus does here.

37 *hiatus.* The Vulgate text of verse 26 says that *chaos* 'confusion' divides them. Valla *Annot in Lucam* 16 had preferred to translate the χάσμα of the Greek text not by the Latin *chaos,* which is merely a transliteration of a Greek word that does not mean 'chasm,' but by *abruptum* 'drop,' *hiatus* 'gap,' or *vorago* 'chasm.' Valla's note went on to explain that ἐκεῖθεν 'from there' at the end of the verse would have been better translated *istinc* 'from there near you' rather than the Vulgate's *inde* 'from there near a third party'; the distinction in meaning is not available to either Greek (as Valla notes) or English. In his annotation *chaos magnum firmatum est* (on 16:26) Erasmus reiterates Valla's point about *chaos,* adding an air of exasperation at the Vulgate translator and more details about the meanings of *chasma* and *chaos.* In the paraphrase here, besides using *hiatus,* he also has Abraham say *istuc* 'to there near you' and *istinc.* But in the next paragraph his Latin for 'abyss' is *chaos.*

38 Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1861A, followed by Hugh of St Cher (on 16:26) 233r, notes that there is no opportunity after death for the performance of good works.

alone in your pleasures with people like yourself, whom you now have as companions in punishment. You did not allow Lazarus and those like Lazarus into your fellowship. Now the same treatment is being given back to you."

'When Abraham had said this, the rich man, shut off from hope of helping himself, wanted at least to take thought for his surviving brothers, lest, if they came to the same place after a lifetime spent in similar fashion, the wretched man's consciousness of evil grow even greater because of such company.[39] But he who once rejected his pleading neighbour now pleads in vain. "If the abyss makes help for me impossible," he said, "I beg you at least to send Lazarus to my father's house – for I have five surviving brothers – to warn them that if they follow in my footsteps they will come to share in this misfortune. Instead they should relieve the needs of the poor with their wealth, and employ their riches not for sensual pleasure but for heartfelt piety. They should not love the things that bring delight for a little while in life, but the things that will produce eternal rest." So spoke the rich man, whom the experience of misfortune had now, too late, made both a suppliant and a teacher.[40] But there is no place for prayers, or ability to warn, from the other side of the grave. For the dead have no traffic with the living.

'So Abraham replied, "There is no need for Lazarus to be called from his rest for this. If your brothers want to be virtuous, they have Moses and the prophets; they should heed them. For in their books they speak to everyone." Then the rich man, a shameless pleader[41] but too late, said, "They will not heed Moses or the prophets, Father Abraham, but if someone returns to them from the dead to give a factual report on what grim things they suffer here who live life there as I did, as nearly all rich people do, they will repent and dispose themselves for a better outcome."[42] To this

* * * * *

39 Hugh of St Cher (on 16:27) 233v says that the rich man speaks not out of charity but out of fear of punishment, 'for he knew that his own punishment would be increased by his brothers' sharing in it.' He is followed by Nicholas of Lyra (on 16:27).

40 Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1861B, followed by the *Gloss* (on 16:27), observes that the rich man has become a teacher too late.

41 Hugh of St Cher (on 16:30) 233v points out that one noteworthy feature of the literal meaning of this story is 'the rich man's importunity with respect to Abraham.'

42 'Dispose themselves for a better outcome' is *sese component ad meliorem frugem.* Erasmus uses a form of a Latin proverb that was often applied to young men who straightened themselves out, or were expected to do so, after a period of youthful wildness; cf eg Plautus *Bacchides* 1084a–1085 and *Trinummus* 79–80,

Abraham replied, "Those are the excuses of people who never want to give up what they wrongly love. Moses and the prophets have more authority with them than the beggar Lazarus would have. But if they do not listen to Moses and the prophets, they are not going to listen to someone who has risen from the dead either. They will claim that it is a ghost or demon."' In these words the Lord was silently criticizing the unbelief of the Jewish race, which, since it has not really believed in Moses and the prophets, even today decries Christ returned from the grave and sitting at the right hand of the Father[43] – yet they would believe what has happened if they had believed in Moses and the prophets, who foretold that this would come to pass.

In this parable our Lord Jesus comforted his disciples, who for love of the heavenly kingdom were going to suffer many afflictions in this world; and he alarmed the Pharisees, scribes, lawyers, priests, and princes, the rich, haughty, proud, and selfish, in the hope that they might amend their sinful life at least out of fear of punishment, or else they in their turn would be objects of mockery in the next world, for here they mocked Jesus when he called them to better things.

Chapter 17

Now it had been laid down by the heavenly Father (and it was better so for the salvation of the human race) that the haughty Pharisees should take offence at the weakness of the human body the Lord had put on, that they should strike at him in his humility and meekness and kill him; nor would they be any gentler to his disciples following in the footsteps of their teacher. And just as the depravity of unbelievers strikes at good people, so the forbearance of the good is the occasion of worse destruction for the wicked. Yet God turns their wickedness to the good of the whole world. So Jesus spoke to his disciples, among whom was Judas, who would be the originator of the offence and would hand Jesus, in the

* * * * *

270–3; Cicero *Pro Caelio* 28, and in the Scriptores Historiae Augustae, *Heliogabalus* 15.1. Perhaps Erasmus' mind goes back to the conclusion of chapter 15; cf n43 there.

43 Cf Col 3:1 and the language of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.
This story is taken to be directed against the Jews by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1861B and Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 536D, followed by the *Gloss* (on 16:21). Hugh of St Cher (on 16:19) 230r introduces his commentary on the parable by saying that the rich man symbolizes the Jews.

world's eyes little and low-born, over to death. But Judas' sinfulness hastened salvation for the world, and his destruction was a salutary warning to everyone.[1]

'It is not possible,' Jesus said, 'for offences not to occur, but that does not excuse the person by whose fault an offence comes. For it would be better for him to have a huge stone, like the lower stone in a mill,[2] tied around his neck and to be thrown head first into the depths of the sea than to be an offence to one of those who in the world's eyes are little. For they have God as their avenger, who thinks himself injured in them. But it is a lighter evil to suffer punishment here, however harsh, than to call down on oneself eternal torments because the little ones whom God loves have been

* * * * *

1 Erasmus' transitional passage between the end of the paraphrase on chapter 16 and the paraphrase on 17:1–3 touches on some themes and points also present in the exegetical tradition. The association of Jesus' remarks in 17:1–2 with his stance against the Pharisees in chapter 16 is made by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 538B–C, the *Gloss* (on 17:1), and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 981A–984B. Bede also introduces Judas Iscariot as a particular instance of one through whom offences come, and explains the Vulgate's Greek loan-word *scandalum* by *offendiculum* 'offence.' Bede is followed on the latter point by the marginal and interlinear *Gloss* (on 17:1) and Hugh of St Cher (on 17:1) 234r; Erasmus uses *offendiculum* and the related verb *offendere* consistently in the paraphrase on 17:1–3.

In this same passage, however, Erasmus alludes not to obstacles to the faith of the little, as 17:1–2 is understood by the main Latin representatives of traditional exegesis, but to the view that Christ's humanity is a stumbling block to the Jews, as in 1 Cor 1:23 (Vulg *scandalum*, AV 'stumbling block'). He even borrows the adjective *pusillus* 'little,' 'weak' from 17:2 and applies it to Jesus, *juxta mundum pusillum et humilem* 'in the world's eyes little and low-born.' Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 828D–829C distinguishes two classes of stumbling blocks, the ones that offend against supreme truth and divine majesty, such as heresies, and the inevitable ones that happen among us from human weakness – quarrels, dissension, insult, whether just or unjust. In Cyril's view the former class is not at issue in the present passage, only the latter. Theophylact, cited above, says that Jesus is showing the disciples here that the Pharisees are the authors of stumbling blocks because of the offence they took at Jesus' words in chapter 16. Erasmus seems closest to Theophylact's (and Cyril's rejected) view.

2 In the annotation *lapis molaris* (on 17:2) Erasmus explained that the Greek words here mean 'donkey-mill,' that is, the lower stone in a mill, the one that catches the grain; he referred to his fuller explanation in an annotation on Matthew 18:6. Here he gives the explanation without using the term. For 'donkey-mill,' now discarded in this verse in favour of 'millstone,' cf Nestle-Aland and Fitzmyer AB Luke.

offended.[3] So beware: your task is not to prevent the occurrence of offences but to take care that they do not come about through some fault of yours. And you will escape the possibility of an offence being charged against you if you not only offer to no one by your own doing an occasion for offence but also either through your meekness remove an offence offered by others or in your forbearance endure it, and not return it.[4]

'For not only will tumults rise up against you from the sinful, but even among yourselves, since you are human, offences will sometimes arise. They will have to be healed by brotherly advice that does not expose the sinner if he can be cured, and that has ready pardon for the repentant. So if by chance it happens that your brother commits some wrong against you, don't pretend that no harm was done, lest lack of punishment invite lack of restraint, but play the part of a trustworthy doctor: show him his disease privately with a gentle scolding, so he may be corrected by his shame. He will listen to a friendly adviser more readily than to a noisy accuser whom he is bound to regard as an enemy. The human temperament is generally such that it prefers to comply with good counsel than to be felled by an insult. It can only be seen as a kindness when someone admonishes in private. One who publicly announces [another's wrongdoing] and issues a summons to punishment does not seem to want to heal his brother's evil but to expose it. But if your brother takes your advice and repents,[5] and acknowledges his fault, let your pardon be quick to welcome back the corrected sinner calmly and kindly; and far from thinking about claiming your rights, be as considerate as you can of his sense of shame.[6] But if in

* * * * *

3 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 538D and the interlinear *Gloss* (on 17:1) also say that temporary punishment on earth is preferable to eternal punishment in the afterlife.

4 The Gospel text 'take heed to yourselves,' the first half of verse 3, is taken as an injunction to the listeners to avoid being the cause of offence by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 539A, the *Gloss* (on 17:1), and Hugh of St Cher (on 17:1) 234r. Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 829C says that Jesus urges forbearance as a means of avoiding offence; Hugh says that we are not to let offences offered go by.

5 *resipuerit.* In the annotation *si poenitentiam egerit* (on 17:3), which might be translated 'if he does penance,' Erasmus had explained that a better Latin translation of the Greek εἰ μετανοήσει would be *si poenituerit* or *si resipuerit* 'if he repents' since there is no question here of the other two steps of sacramental penance, satisfaction and penalty. He paraphrases accordingly. See chapter 11 n46.

6 For the amplification of the process of brotherly admonishment, with its emphasis on privacy and consideration for the sinner's feelings, cf Matt 18:15 and

human weakness he relapses into the fault, even if he sins against you seven times in the same day, and repents seven times a day, and in his eagerness to placate you says, "I have sinned; I am sorry," forgive him; grant him heartfelt pardon for his fault. This readiness in forgiving will keep peace and harmony between you better than a mutual exchange of offences.'

At these words, since the apostles understood that the source of all the gospel virtues was faith, the faith that the Lord so carefully required in the doing of miracles, that he so often praised in many, even non-Jews, that always receives what it asks for, and that they themselves had used in dispelling illness and driving out demons (and they knew quite well that it was from a defect of faith that they had not been able to free a person in bondage to a mute demon)[7] – Indeed, if someone has not formed in his heart an assured faith, he will not be fit for the other gospel teachings either; for when will he ignore the pleasures of this world, when will he pour out his riches for the poor, when will he forgive his brother his wrong, when will he do good to those who have done him ill, when will he patiently accept imprisonment, scourging, and death, if he is not convinced that great is the reward prepared for him in heaven?[8] – Since, I say, the apostles understood this, they said to the Lord, 'Lord, since we have nothing good except from you, we ask that you increase our faith.'

But the Lord knew that his apostles were still thickheaded and imperfect, and were asking for an increase in faith just so that they would be better at working miracles. He did indeed affirm the strength and power of

* * * * *

the comments of Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1861C–1862A (who contrasts the reactions of one privately admonished and one publicly accused), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 984B–D, and most fully Hugh of St Cher (on 17:3) 234V, who cites Gregory and Bede on the importance of not overlooking our brothers' sins. Medical metaphors like those in this passage appear in Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 829D and in Theophylact.

7 Examples of the consequences of faith or its absence in Jesus' ministry to this point, alluded to here: praise for the faith of a non-Jew, 7:1–10 and Matt 8:5–13 (the centurion), Matt 15:28 (the Syrophoenician woman); faith that receives what it asks for, 11:9 and Matt 7:7, Matt 21:22; the disciples drive out demons, 9:1 (commissioning of the twelve); the disciples' inability to drive out the mute spirit, 9:37–43, Matt 17:14–21, Mark 9:14–29.

8 The interruption of the sentence beginning 'At these words' is Erasmus'. The items in this list of the works of a believer can be illustrated from many of Jesus' sayings or other NT passages. Some examples from this Gospel: giving riches to the poor, 18:22; forgiving one's brother, 17:3–4; doing good to those who do one ill, 6:35. In general what is said here echoes the Sermon on the Plain, 6:20–38, including 'great is your reward in heaven,' 6:23.

faith if it is also pure, but he declared that it had to be joined with the highest degree of humility, and was not to be brought out for empty show, but only when the salvation of one's neighbour or the glory of God requires. He spoke in a comparison: 'If you have faith like a mustard seed, which is tiny and humble, and does not put forth its power unless it is crushed or chewed, you will say to this sycamine tree, which has driven its roots far and wide and seems impossible for any power to tear up, "Be uprooted, and be transplanted into the sea," and it will obey you.'[9] Now in the mustard seed the Lord meant himself, who, though he showed himself the humblest of all things, still had the secret power of his divine nature hidden within, which at length revealed itself after the seed was crushed on the cross and buried in death.[10] The power of this seed worked in the disciples, and they

* * * * *

9 In a series of annotations, *si habueritis, dicetis huic,* and *et obediet* (on 17:6) Erasmus pointed out that the Vulgate indicative future perfect and future verb forms ('if you have,' 'you will say,' and 'it will obey') in verse 6 do not reproduce the contrary-to-fact (unreal) conditional sentence of the Greek text ('if you had,' 'you would say,' and 'it would obey'). However, his paraphrase leaves the Vulgate's syntax unchanged. There is a change in the imperative verbs from the Vulgate forms *eradicare* 'be uprooted' and *transplantare* 'be transplanted' to *eradicator* and *transplantator.* The former are conventionally called 'present' and the latter 'future' imperatives. The effect cannot be reproduced in English, but in colloquial Latin, as represented in the comic playwrights Plautus and Terence and in Cicero's informal letters, the 'future' imperatives are often found in sentences that also set some condition for the action commanded. So here: *If* you have faith, you will say, Be uprooted. See Raphael Kühner and Carl Stegmann *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinische Sprache* II-1 (Hannover 1976) 196–7.

In another annotation on the same verse, *arbori moro,* he observed that in the Greek text the name of the tree is 'sycamine' not 'sycomore,' and the command given to it is not literally 'be transplanted' but 'be planted.' The paraphrase adopts the first correction but not the second.

10 The power of the mustard seed that Erasmus mentions here is its latent heat, released by grinding or chewing. Cf the paraphrase on 13:19 and n17 there. Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 833D says that faith like a mustard seed means hot, burning faith. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 540B, followed by the *Gloss* (on 17:6), also says the point of the comparison is the mustard seed's combination of humble appearance and inner heat, released by grinding. Bede goes on to describe a cure and preventative for 'noxious humours of the head' compounded of ground mustard and honey-water and used as a gargle; he allegorizes this application as faith. Hugh of St Cher (on 17:6) 234V speaks of the humble outward appearance of the believer, for whom the heat of faith in his breast is only made hotter by adversity. Although Erasmus begins his paraphrase with the release of power effected by grinding, his allegorization is more akin to the Gospel's earlier description of the mustard seed as the origin of a mighty

were not supposed to claim any of it as their own possession, for they were not the originators of what they did but only the instruments; they would pay the penalty if they were slack in carrying out their instructions, and would assign all the glory to God if anything noteworthy or grand was done through their agency.[11]

Jesus implanted this teaching in their hearts with an additional parable: 'Which of you is so accommodating a master that, if he has a slave who is a field hand or cowherd,[12] on the slave's return from the field he promptly says to him, "Come in, have a place at the table"? Does he not instead speak in this way: "Get my dinner, and gird yourself up and serve me till I have finished eating and drinking. You will get your food and drink afterwards." Yet the slave has faithfully completed his work in the field. Does the master feel gratitude towards the slave for having done what he was told? I think not; but he would have exacted a penalty if the slave had not carried them out. Why? For no other reason than that they are slaves, and they owe all their labour to their master, whose property they themselves are also. What is more, the master claims for himself the credit for everything that is done, for he does whatever he does through the slaves, who without him can do no good at all. Similarly in your case, do not appropriate for yourselves the glory of your good deeds; just do your work faithfully. And when you have done everything that was bidden you, say, "We are useless slaves; we have done what we were obliged to do." For this humility will preserve the treasury of faith in you. Leave the rest to your master. Let no one claim honour for himself; let no one pre-empt the judgment of his master. He knows the time, and will not cheat anyone of his reward. As for you in

* * * * *

tree (13:19), and perhaps also to the statement 'the seed is the word of God' at 8:11 (the parable of the sower) and the comments in John 12:24 and 1 Cor 15:35–8 that a seed must die to yield a new crop.

11 Erasmus introduces the next parable by summarizing its meaning, as he so often does. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1865A, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 836B–D, and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 988A–C say that the parable is about not taking pride in one's own works or accomplishments or seeking glory from them, for they are all owed to God; Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 541C emphasizes, as Erasmus will do at the conclusion of the parable, the humility of the slave's position.

12 *bubulcus.* In the annotation *aut pascentem boves* (on 17:7) Erasmus had noted that the Greek text says only 'herding,' not 'herding cattle.' He added that the Greek term is used more of sheep herding than of cattle herding, and that he had actually seen *oves* 'sheep' written above the line in one manuscript; he also believed it was the most probable reading in Ambrose (cf *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1965A, where the PL reading is *oves*). Notwithstanding these observations, the paraphrase accommodates the traditional Vulgate.

the meantime, remember that you are nothing more than slaves, obliged to labour.'

Now it happened that as the Lord made his way towards Jerusalem, he was travelling through Samaria and Galilee. For he liked to visit Samaria and Galilee often, when there was opportunity, in order to reproach the inhabitants of Jerusalem for their unbelief, since they detested the Samaritans worse than the gentiles, and considered the Galileans half pagans.[13] But when he entered a small village,[14] ten men with leprosy met him. One may well believe that heretics are symbolized, completely corrupted within by evil emotions, and with mottled skin on the outside, as if it were the dishonest teaching that mixes false things with true – an infectious and detestable breed, and therefore kept far from traffic with other people.[15] But there is no breed of evil that Jesus does not heal, providing it comes into his sight, providing the sickness is revealed to him and trust is there.[16] They acknowledged their own sickness, and so they did not come too close, but standing off at a distance, they raised their voices and called out to the Lord, 'Jesus, teacher, have mercy on us!' Jesus heard their call, the witness of their trust, and turned his eyes towards them. Blessed call, that makes the Lord attend! Blessed gaze, that summons mercy! But Jesus said nothing in reply except that they should go and show themselves to the priests (for

* * * * *

13 For Erasmus' general representation of the Samaritans and Galileans as spiritual superiors of the Jews of Judea, see eg the paraphrases on John 1:43, 4:4–12, and especially 4:43–4 CWE 46 35, 53–5, and 62, and the paraphrase on 10:32–7.

14 *viculus*. Erasmus has replaced the Vulgate *castellum*, which in classical Latin means 'fort, stronghold, bastion,' with a word that corresponds better to the Greek κώμη 'hamlet.' See CWE 46 143 n28.

15 Leprosy is allegorized as heresy here by Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.40.2, followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 542B–C, the *Gloss* (on 17:11), and Hugh of St Cher (on 17:11) 235V. For the various skin conditions leading to a declaration of polluting leprosy in Mosaic law, see Lev 13:1–46; the injunctions to show oneself to the priest to determine whether one has been cured, along with the requisite sacrifices, are in Lev 14:2–32, cited by Nicholas of Lyra (on 17:14).

16 'Trust' is *fiducia*. Throughout this episode Erasmus speaks of *fiducia* 'trust,' 'confidence' (and translated 'hope' just below); he even puts it in Jesus' mouth as a substitute for the Vulgate's *fides* 'faith' in verse 19. For his perception of the difference in meaning between *fides* and *fiducia*, see eg the annotation *sperandarum substantia* (on Heb 11:1), where he said, 'In this place *fides* is not being used strictly for that by which we believe the things we ought to believe, but for that by which we hope, that is, for *fiducia* itself.' See also the annotation *ex fide in fidem* (on Rom 1:17) CWE 56 42–5 and the Translators' Note to CWE 42 xxxvii.

the authority to distinguish between leper and clean lay with the priests). They obeyed and went, full of good hope. And as they went suddenly they were cleansed.

There was a like trust in all of them, but not a like gratitude. Only a Samaritan, when he realized he had clearly been freed from his sickness, made no secret of God's kindness to him but promptly came back to Jesus, praising God[17] in a loud voice, and fell face down at Jesus' feet, worshipping him and giving thanks.

Jesus was well aware that the benefit had come to all ten, but he wanted to rebuke the ingratitude of the ones who had tried to make off with such a great benefit from God. So he said, 'Weren't ten made clean? And where are the nine?'[18] For the Lord does not recognize the ungrateful, and he showed that those who do not give thanks for a good deed are unworthy of the benefit they have received. For God does not permit his good deeds to be hidden. When the Samaritan held his peace, not only grateful but also humble,[19] having come only to do his own duty, not to accuse others, Jesus turned to the bystanders and said, 'Out of the ten not one was found[20] to come back and praise God except this lone foreigner. Yet it would have been more fitting for the others to do so, since they boast of themselves

* * * * *

17 *clarificans Deum.* Though *clarificans* is the reading of *1535* and of LB, the LB editor notes that 'the other edition' has *glorificans,* which was the word in *1523, 1524,* and *1534.* In the annotation *magnificans* (on 17:15), Erasmus had said that *glorificans* translates the Greek δοξάζων, and in fact was used later, for variety, by the Latin translator (cf eg 23:47 Vulg). While the noun *gloria* certainly is the closest Latin for the Greek noun δόξα, there does not seem to be a significant difference between *glorificans* and *clarificans,* nor is it certain that this is Erasmus' own alteration rather than an educated typesetter's error.

18 The paraphrase repeats the Vulgate text of Jesus' two questions, although in the annotation *novem ubi sunt* (on 17:17) Erasmus had remarked that the Greek phrasing, with verb omitted, was more appealing and had suggested a Latin version to reproduce the effect of the Greek.

19 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 542C injects into his discussion of verse 13 a reference to the humility of the lepers who called out to Jesus; in discussing verses 16–18 he also asserts a close connection between gratitude and the humility that knows both its own prideful tendencies and the boundless good provided by the creator (543B).

20 *nullus repertus est.* Erasmus' annotation *non est inventus* (on 17:18) had made two points: that the Greek text is in the plural 'were they not found,' and that *reperire* was a better Latin verb than *invenire* for the sense of 'finding' here, ie, 'coming across by chance' rather than 'seeking out.' Cf his *Paraphrasis in elegantias Vallae* ASD I-4 310 847–50. In the paraphrase he makes the vocabulary change but preserves the singular of his Vulgate.

as worshippers of God because they are Jews. Yet in fact this Samaritan surpasses[21] their religiosity.' On saying this he addressed the Samaritan, who was face down on the ground: 'Rise and go,' he said, 'assured that this benefit of mine will be yours permanently, since you got it for yourself by your trust.'

Now Jesus often talked about the kingdom of God. But the Pharisees did not yet understand that the gospel kingdom is a spiritual kingdom; they were imagining some kingdom in which the Jewish race would rule the other nations. So they came up to him and asked when the kingdom of God would come. But Jesus, who customarily gave ambiguous answers when mention was made of the last day, said, 'The kingdom of God will not come like a worldly kingdom, so that either its time or its place can be watched for. For it is not a kingdom of bodies but of hearts, and it does not consist of visible but invisible defences. So there will be no saying to you, "Look here" or "Look there." For what need is there to watch for a place when the kingdom of God is within you?[22] Why do you expect from without what you have within, which is carried everywhere with you if you wish it? Why are you awaiting the arrival of what is already here? Wherever there is a heart that is above the riches, the pleasures, the honours of this world, and is in short a despiser of life; wherever there is a heart robust in faith, ablaze with love, inspired by the heavenly Spirit, there is the kingdom of God. It only remains for you to embrace what is here, lest that day which will perfect and reveal this kingdom come suddenly and find you unprepared.'

Since the disciples, who themselves were also imagining that in a little while an Israelite kingdom would be revealed,[23] did not sufficiently under-

* * * * *

21 *vincit* in the lifetime editions, though LB prints *vicit* 'has surpassed'

22 Whether one is to understand 'within you' or 'among you' from the Greek preposition *ἐντός* is a much debated question; cf Fitzmyer AB Luke 1160–2 for a discussion of various views. Erasmus has no annotation on this place, and the paraphrase simply copies the Vulgate Latin *intra vos* 'within you.' His elaboration focuses entirely on this version, besides anticipating the interpretation of the chapter's end as a call for preparation. Hugh of St Cher (on 17:21) 237r is apparently the only representative of traditional Latin exegesis to discuss the other possibility as well, that the meaning might be *inter vos* 'among you,' but the 'you' in his view are the Pharisees. Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 841A–B understands the saying the same way, citing the Baptist's statement at John 1:26, but without further comment.

23 The *Gloss* (on 17:20) cites Acts 1:6 and Cleophas' remark in 24:21 to show that the disciples also were expecting a Jewish kingdom in Palestine; Hugh of St Cher (on 17:20–1) 236v makes the same claim.

stand this either, he turned to them and tempered his words so as to make his followers always prepared for the last day, and to do away with the questions about the time; he wanted instead to equip them for the looming crisis of the cross. 'The time will come,' he said, 'when you will long to enjoy for even one day the sight of the Son of Man, whom many now scorn when he is with them, and what you desire will not be granted. Even so there will be no lack of those who, playing up to human desire, will try to show him coming, saying, "Look here, look there." Put no faith in such prophets. If they say, "He is here among us," do not go; if they say, "Look, there he is, over there," do not go in search of him. Believe in those things that once were foretold by the holy prophets and that you see being fulfilled. This one thing God did not want to be revealed to humankind; and he did not want the time known in advance precisely because it is better this way for the salvation of the human race, whom he wants to be prepared at all times.[24] Just as a burst of lightning flashes without warning from one part of the sky all the way to the other[25] before you realize it is coming, so the Son of Man will come, in great glory indeed but unlooked-for, on the day that he alone knows but wants to remain unknown to you.

'But he will not reveal his majesty till he has fulfilled the dispensation of his humility. For the way to the splendour of the heavenly kingdom must

* * * * *

24 Cf Matt 24:36 and Mark 13:32. The Matthew passage is cited in discussion of this place by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1866A–B. Hugh of St Cher (on 17:20) 236v, also citing the Matthew passage, goes on to say that since the day of the coming of the kingdom is unknown, it behoves everyone to be prepared and live as if he would be judged today. Matt 24:36, however, in some texts known to the church Fathers and in modern texts, asserts that 'not even the Son knows' the day of the coming. Erasmus says the opposite in the next sentence. See his annotation *nec angeli coelorum* (on Matt 24:36), where he discusses the status of the phrase. Ambrose, citing Acts 1:7, suggests that the Son knows but declines to say, since it is not in the best interest of mortals to know.

25 'From one part of the sky all the way to the other' is *ab una parte coeli usque ad adversam.* Erasmus substitutes normal classical Latin for a Vulgate expression that is formed in imitation of the Greek text, where there is a typical Greek idiom consisting of the definite article plus a dependent prepositional phrase to form a noun expression. See his annotation *de sub caelo in ea quae sub caelo sunt* (on 17:24). The lack of a definite article in Latin makes a parallel Latin construction impossible. In the same annotation he had said that the point of the lightning simile was that the coming of the kingdom would be unexpected as regards both time and place. Cf the paraphrase above, where Jesus' answer to the Pharisees emphasizes the place of the kingdom, while his intention in his remarks to the disciples has to do with the time of its arrival.

be shown first, the door of the kingdom of heaven must be opened first, so that entry is possible. Otherwise the kingdom of God would come in a way scarcely fortunate for those who have not prepared themselves for it. Therefore before the majesty you prematurely desire reveals itself, the Son of Man must suffer many things and be condemned by this nation, so that, as a flame blazes up after smouldering, likewise after shame the glory of God will reveal itself more splendidly.

'So then, there is an easy remedy against that day's overwhelming anyone, if each person prepares himself as if the day were already almost here. But people who have surrendered themselves to the world will promise themselves postponement or even tell themselves that the day will not come at all, and in this expectation will be free to indulge their own desires without a care. And so the same thing will happen in the days of the Son of Man as happened long ago in the days of Noah: They were marrying wives and giving in marriage, as if the flood, which was postponed, were not going to come at all. But the evil fell upon them unawares. Only Noah, with a few others, was saved in the ark. All the rest perished. There was a similar look to events in Lot's time: since divine vengeance was postponed, they thought that whatever sins they had committed would go unpunished, and so they were eating and drinking, buying and selling, planting and building without a care. But retribution fell on these too, carefree and without forethought as they were. For on the same day that Lot left Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and without warning slew everyone.[26]

'There will be the same look to events in the world when the Son of Man without warning reveals his majesty. When that day falls upon you, let every care for earthly things be cast away. Let each person only take thought for himself as best he may in the immediate danger. Thus, let one whom that day finds on his roof, with his household goods inside, not go down to remove his possessions; let him think only of his own safety. Likewise if that day comes upon someone in the field, let him not run for home, because the danger will be too immediate to brook any delay. In

* * * * *

26 So the text following 'in the days of Noah' in *1534* and *1535*. In *1523* and *1524* it had omitted the end of verse 27 and all of 28, reading as follows: 'they were eating and drinking, buying and selling, planting and building, just exactly as if the flood, which was postponed, were not going to come at all. But the evil fell upon them unawares. For on the same day when Lot left Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and without warning slew everyone.' Even the corrected text of *1534* and *1535* omits the 'eating and drinking' of verse 27.

whatever circumstances each and every person is found, let him take heed for his life in rapid flight. Remember what happened to Lot's wife: she only looked back, and she was lost, so intolerant of any delay is the swiftness of the evil. Whoever is less encumbered for escape will be safer. Further, to be pursuing the things to which we usually give our attention in order to carry on our lives – clothing, money, a house, or things of that kind – at that time will be to lose our lives. But whoever discards all his encumbrances and ignores the material necessities of life will gain life. For at that time there will be no room for thinking about the life of the body, since the life of the soul will be in danger. Not property, not rank, not manner of life will save a person in that crisis, but a disposition prepared for the end. For of two very closely attached persons, without warning one will be taken up into life and the other left for destruction. I tell you, in the night when the Son of Man comes there will be two men in the same bed who will be separated without warning by the difference in their reward, for one will be taken up to everlasting bliss and the other left for everlasting destruction. There will be two men grinding in the same mill, one of whom will be taken and the other left.[27] Two men will be working in the same field; one will be taken and the other left.'[28]

* * * * *

27 The addition of the mill, not found in Luke's text, is from the parallel at Matt 24:41. Erasmus had found the reading here, *in pistrino* 'in the mill,' in Ambrose (cf *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1869C–1870B), as he said in the annotation *duo in agro* (on 17:35), though he supposed Ambrose was alluding to the Matthew passage by including it. However, there seems to be no textual parallel for Erasmus' change of gender from women to men grinding: he uses the masculine words *duo, quorum,* and *alter* for the Gospel text's feminines *duae, una,* and *altera,* which all translate analogous feminine words in the Greek. On the other hand, there is a pronounced tendency in the exegetical tradition to understand the 'two women' as allegorically standing for some other class of persons, subject in some way to the rule and guidance of their betters (the explanation of their being female in the text). So Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.44 (who takes their milling as an allegory for involvement in worldly, ie financial, affairs), followed by the *Gloss* (on 17:35) and Hugh of St Cher (on 17:35) 238v. Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 845D (also in the *Catena aurea* on 17:35), followed by Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 997C–D, sees the milling as indication that the class referred to is the poor.

28 This sentence paraphrases a verse found in the Vulgate of Erasmus' day (35b; 36 AV, RSV); cf Matt 24:40. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1870B–1872C, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 549B–C, the *Gloss* (on 17:35), and Hugh of St Cher (on 17:35), 238v all include this third group in their discussions. Cyril and Theophylact do not mention it. In the annotation *duo in agro* (on 17:35) Erasmus had pointed out that it was not found in the Greek manuscripts known to him, though Ambrose

Since the disciples, not comprehending, heard these things as if in a dream, they said to Jesus, 'Where, Lord?' They were still dreaming of flesh, and they wanted to find out the location of the kingdom. But Jesus wanted to indicate in a riddle that the saints, wherever they are found, are inseparable from the Lord, so he replied, 'Wherever the body is, that is where the eagles will gather too. It does not matter where you are, as long as you are with me, for I shall feed your hearts on my very self, the food of everlasting bliss.'[29]

Chapter 18

Now when the very end of the world looms, the worst storm of persecution will rise up against the godly, so bad that if possible even the elect are to be led astray[1] (though there is never a time when the relentlessness of the wicked is not raging against the good). For this reason our Lord Jesus taught his followers that in their ills they should seek aid from nowhere else than from God, in the meantime neither scheming any revenge nor warding off one wrong with another. And if God does not immediately free them from affliction, they still are not on that account to cease from prayer. For he will assuredly heed the prayers of his people when the time is right, and the delay will be all to the good of the godly, while the ungodly will be more thoroughly crushed the more they had convinced themselves that they were doing what they did with impunity.[2] The Lord implanted this teaching in the hearts of his followers in a parable as follows:

* * * * *

mentioned it. In the paraphrase he merely repeats the text of verse 35 (with the changes noted in n27 above) almost word for word, having amplified only verse 34, and that lightly.

29 The allegory of the body as Jesus and his feeding of his followers on it is made explicit by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1872D–1873A, Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 24 PL 26 186B–C, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 550A–B, the *Gloss* (on 17:37), Hugh of St Cher (on 17:37) 238v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 17:37). Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 848A–B (also in the *Catena aurea* on 17:37) takes the body as the Lord's and suggests that the eagles are his holy ones.

1 In form and language this clause closely imitates the same statement at Matt 24:24.

2 In his remarks on 18:8 Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 851D interprets the following parable as a call to incessant prayer in the face of the end-time. Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1000C–D has the same interpretation, but like Erasmus here introduces it at the outset of his discussion and connects it explicitly to the warnings in 17:22–36.

'In a certain city there was a judge,' he said, 'impious and without shame, who neither feared God nor respected any human being. His impiety made him have no fear of God, while his power made him have no respect for humans. In the same city there was a widow, and because she was being hard-pressed by an opponent, she approached that peerless judge, in whose hands lay the supreme power, and appealed to him with requests for his help against the ferocity of her opponent. "I am being worsted in a good case," she would say, "because of my opponent's riches and influence. I am a widow and destitute. Defend my right against the ferocity of my opponent." Though he was regularly appealed to by the widow in this fashion, still for a long time he pretended not to notice and was unwilling to help the widow, even though great power is given to certain individuals precisely so that they can assist the orphaned and fatherless, the widows and humble folk, against the wealthy and powerful.[3] At last, since she did not stop making her appeal to him, the judge began to think to himself, "Though I neither fear God nor respect mortals, still, this widow is a nuisance to me with her persistence. So I will help her against her opponent's ferocity – not that I wish her well but so that she and her insults won't eventually[4] come back, and, since she has been spurned so many times, brand my good name with some mark of reproach,[5] on the grounds that though I hold the position of chief judge in this city I nonetheless stubbornly let an oppressed widow down."'

After he told the parable the Lord added, 'Do you hear what the impious and wicked judge is saying? Conquered by her unremitting prayers he aids the widow. And will God, who is most just and merciful towards his chosen, shut his ears when he is appealed to day and night by their prayers and cries, will he refuse to free them from the violence of their oppressors and instead calmly and coolly allow them to be assaulted with impunity? No, I tell you, he will not. He will either turn the hearts of the wicked so that their will is changed and they cease to attack, or he will remove

* * * * *

3 Hugh of St Cher (on 18:3–4) 239r cites Isa 1:23, Jer 5:28, and Ecclus 35:14–15 as parallels to the widow's helplessness and the judge's (neglected) obligation to help her.

4 'For a long time' [two sentences above] is *diu*, 'eventually' is *tandem*. Erasmus substitutes two standard classical Latin adverbs for the Vulgate expressions *per multum tempus* and *in novissimo*, following his annotation *per multum tempus* (on 18:4–5).

5 *notam aliquam inurat famae meae*. Erasmus changes, and perhaps renders more conventional, the metaphor *sugillet* 'lest she beat me black and blue' in the Latin text of 18:5. In the annotation *sugillet me* (on 18:5) he comments that the verb describes boxers hitting high so their opponents' faces are bruised.

their capacity to do harm, or once his chosen have been snatched from all evils he will transport them into eternal rest. Assuredly, when that last day comes, then neither Satan nor his instruments, wicked human beings, will have any power against those whom God has chosen as sharers in his kingdom. For when the impiety of the wicked has reached its peak then the Son of Man will come without warning, and more quickly in any case than the wicked expected. But when the Son of Man comes, is he going to find faith on earth? For so great will be both the number and the shamelessness of the wicked that faith will survive among very few. Yet even so, whoever those are among whom true steadfast faith in God is found, they will be set free, and God will be their avenger.'[6]

Now this parable terrified the openly godless, who habitually assaulted the godly. But there was a certain class of righteous Pharisees who trusted in their own works and claimed for themselves the glory of righteousness from those works, although with God no one is truly righteous.[7] And not only were they stupidly self-satisfied but they were even contemptuous of others for being sinners compared to themselves, though the humility of those others is more pleasing to God than the works of these Pharisees. Against such righteous Pharisees and as consolation for sinners wholeheartedly dissatisfied with themselves, the Lord put forward the following parable:

'It happened that two men went up to the temple to pray, one of whom was a Pharisee and the other a tax collector. The Pharisee, standing next to the mercy seat as if he deserved to speak with God at close quarters,[8] prayed

* * * * *

6 The amplification of verse 8 draws on discussions in the exegetical tradition on this passage. The first issue is in what sense vindication of the just is to take place against the enemies for whom they have been told to pray (as at 6:27–8). The answer offered by eg Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 551B, followed by the *Gloss* (on 18:3), Hugh of St Cher (on 18:8) 239v (less exactly), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 18:7) is that the evil will 'perish' by converting to righteousness or by losing their power against the good as they are punished; Erasmus reflects these two possibilities, though not the problem to which they are addressed. The second issue is the implication of Jesus' question 'Do you think that when the Son of Man comes he will find faith on earth?' The implied scarcity of faith at the time of the second coming is discussed by Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 851D and Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 551C–D, followed by the *Gloss* (on 18:8) and Hugh of St Cher (on 18:8) 239v.

7 Cf Rom 3:10–20.

8 For the amplification of the Pharisee's location and its presumed reason, not paralleled in the exegetical tradition, cf Num 7:89. The mercy seat (*propitiatorium*) is mentioned in OT descriptions of the fittings of the tabernacle, eg Exodus 25 and 37, Lev 16:14, and in Heb 9:5.

silently like this: "I give you thanks, God, that I am not like other people,[9] those who live by robbery, those who increase their property by cheating, those who befoul the marriage beds of others in adultery, or, indeed, those who practice a demeaning trade and in order to win favour with princes plunder the people of God, as this tax collector does.[10] I do not indulge in extravagance as ordinary people do; I fast twice a week, and I am so far from cheating anyone that I spend a tithe of all my goods on the poor." This was the prayer of the swollen-headed Pharisee, who, though he made true statements and gave thanks to God, was displeasing in God's sight for the very reason that he was pleased with himself: a self-flatterer but full of abuse against his neighbour.

'On the other hand, the tax collector, entirely dissatisfied with himself because he knew his own sins, stood far away from the sacred objects, so ashamed and penitent that he did not even dare to raise his eyes to heaven[11] but struck his breast, saying, "God be merciful to me a sinner." The Pharisee only gave thanks, thinking that he had everything necessary for perfect godliness, and did not confess his trespasses, though in the very midst of his prayers he sinned most gravely, boasting of his own qualities and scorning the penitent man, a prideful glorifier of himself and a reckless

* * * * *

Erasmus' introduction of the mercy seat in this incident attracted the disapproval of Noël Béda and the Paris faculty of theology. Erasmus defended his paraphrase in the *Supputatio* (1527) LB IX 613D–E, arguing that he had drawn a reasonable conclusion about the Pharisee's position, closer to but not within the holy of holies, from Luke's comment that the tax collector stood far off. He added that Augustine had also elaborated this point. Augustine indeed had made much of the relative positions of Pharisee and tax collector in the temple and before God in *Sermones de scripturis* 115 PL 38 656, but without explicit reference there to the *propitiatorium*.

9 'Other people' is *caeteris hominibus*. In the annotation *caeteri hominum* (on 18:11) Erasmus had said that the genitive *hominum* was an imitation of the Greek idiom, where Latin would more naturally have the noun *homines* in agreement with the adjective *caeteri*. (In fact *homines* is the reading of both Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 115 PL 38 656 and Valla *Annot in Lucam* 18) Here he adopts his own recommendation to have noun and adjective agree.

10 *qualis hic est publicanus*. Valla *Annot in Lucam* 18 had pointed out that the Vulgate's *velut etiam* was not the natural Latin way to follow out the comparison begun in 'like other people'; Erasmus remarked in the annotation *velut etiam* (on 18:11) that Valla's comment had more to do with style than theological content, but he still makes a stylistic alteration in the paraphrase.

11 *ut nec oculos auderet in caelum attollere*. The annotation *nolebat nec oculos* (on 18:13) had said that the Vulgate double negative *nolebat nec* 'did not even not want' was likely to offend the dialecticians and could have been rendered differently; the paraphrase eliminates the duplication.

accuser of his neighbour.[12] On the other hand the tax collector made no mention of his good deeds. Only recognizing the evils in himself he beat on a breast aware of its guilt and begged for the Lord's mercy.

'Do you want to know the outcome of the respective prayers? The tax collector, who had come into the temple a sinner, went home a more righteous man in the eyes of God than that Pharisee[13] who thought himself completely righteous. For whoever exalts himself in his own sight will be cast down in the eyes of God. And whoever casts himself down in his own sight will stand high in the eyes of God.'

Now here is another occasion when the Lord commended to us humility joined with simplicity.[14] Mothers[15] were bringing their infants to Jesus so that he could touch them and bless them; for they thought that the children would thus be safer from the accidents and illnesses to which that age is generally subject. When the disciples saw this, they scolded the women because they were making work for the Lord with such trivial matters, and he was busy enough, as the disciples thought, with other things.[16] But al-

* * * * *

12 The exegetical tradition generally, exemplified by Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 115 PL 38 656, criticizes the Pharisee in this episode for two sins, boastful pride in himself and abuse of his neighbour, and for making no confession of wrongdoing and plea for forgiveness.

13 'A more righteous man ... than that Pharisee' is *justior illo Pharisaeo*. The annotation *iustificatus ab illo* (on 18:14) had criticized the un-Latin translation of the Greek παρ' ἐκεῖνον 'compared to him'; the paraphrase substitutes a standard Latin expression of comparison.

14 Erasmus follows the exegetical tradition in marking out humility, simplicity, and innocence as the lessons to be learned from Jesus' blessing of the children. Cf Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1874C, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 856B, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 553C (like Erasmus, at the start of his discussion of the episode), and Hugh of St Cher (on 18:16) 240V.

15 *matres*. The masculine pronouns in 18:15 and in the parallels at Matt 19:13 and Mark 10:13 can be understood as referring either to fathers or to parents (or caretakers) of both sexes, but not exclusively to women, bringing the children to Jesus. The question is not raised in Erasmus' usual sources in the Latin exegetical tradition, but Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 856A–B paraphrases thus: 'Women were running up, and in particular mothers were bringing infants forward so that he might lay his hands on them.' In his own paraphrase on Matt 19:13 Erasmus speaks of the parents who wanted to present their infants to Jesus but goes on to say that the disciples thought it unsuitable for their Lord to be harassed by mothers and babies (LB VII 104C). Theophylact *Enarr in Matt* (on 19:13) PG 123 353B says that the mothers were bringing their children forward.

16 The exegetes agree that the disciples' motivation is a wish to spare Jesus unnecessary trouble; cf Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1874B–C, Cyril *Expl in*

though Jesus was well aware that his followers were doing this out of a kind of overzealous diligence, he nevertheless wanted to demonstrate for us a model of simplicity, humility, and innocence, and at the same time to teach his pastors that no one was to be scorned, no matter how lowly or weak. So he called his disciples[17] to him and said, 'Let the children come to me, and do not prevent them from being brought near, for of such is the kingdom of God. Let this example be offered to all, so they may know how progress is to be made. Children know no deceit, they know no contempt, they know no striking back, they know no repaying of insults, they know no greed, they know no self-seeking; their innocence is uncompromised, their simplicity is uncompromised.[18] I tell you, the kingdom of God welcomes only those transformed to this image.[19] So, unless one approaches the gospel teaching in the same simplicity as these children possess,[20] he will not enter the kingdom of God.'

* * * * *

Lucam PG 72 856A, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 553C), and following Bede the *Gloss* (on 18:15) and Hugh of St Cher (on 18:15) 240V.

17 *discipulos suos*. Here the paraphrase and Erasmus' annotation diverge markedly. The annotation *convocans illos* (on 18:16) correctly notes that the Latin masculine pronoun *illos* 'them' must refer to the children, *pueros*, of Jesus' subsequent statement, because it translates the Greek neuter pronoun αὐτά 'them,' referring to the children τὰ παιδία (neuter in Greek) in the same statement. Valla *Annot in Lucam* 18 had made the same point. Nevertheless the paraphrase understands the pronoun to mean the disciples and invokes Jesus' general purpose of teaching the disciples their future role as pastors. The version of the story in Mark 10:14 also has Jesus addressing the disciples.

18 The qualities of children that make them models for followers of Jesus are variously listed in traditional exegesis; cf Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1873B–C, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 856B, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 553D, Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1008C–1009A, and Hugh of St Cher (on 18:16) 240V. Erasmus' list has most in common with Ambrose (no striking back, no greed, no ambition), Theophylact (no contempt; in summary, innocence and simplicity), and Hugh (no deceit).

19 *ad hanc imaginem transformatos*, echoing the language of 2 Cor 3:18 *in eandem imaginem transformamur* 'we are changed into the same image' (AV).

20 'In the same simplicity as these children possess' is *ea simplicitate qua sunt hi pueri*. The paraphrase elaborates on the *sicut puer* 'as a child' of the Latin text. Valla *Annot in Lucam* 18 had said that the *sicut* implied 'as a child receives' [the kingdom of heaven] and called this a theological misstatement since not children as such but those who are like children receive the kingdom of heaven; hence the word should be not *sicut* but *velut* or *tamquam* 'like a child.' Erasmus picked up Valla's point in the annotation *et sicut puer* (on 18:17), distinguishing between imitation of the character of a child and imitation of an action of a child. His paraphrase abandons the question of the proper conjunction or adverb in favour of an expression that removes any ambiguity.

Again, one of the important people[21] came up to Jesus, as if to make plain in the very doing the meaning of what Jesus had said about children. He said, 'Good teacher, what should I do to attain everlasting life?' Now Jesus wanted to show that the name 'good' applied to no one except to God alone, who is good by his very nature, so he replied, 'Why do you call me good? No one is good except God alone' – not that the Lord did not acknowledge the name 'good' in so far as he was God, but because the rich man[22] was attributing the word 'good' to Jesus as a human being, perhaps intending to claim it for himself also if the occasion arose. So he was not properly calling 'good' one whom he did not believe to be God. Hence the Lord refused the honour of the appellation at that time because he understood that his questioner was not completely without arrogance, since he thought himself well supplied with an abundance of good works. Then to reveal the man's disease Jesus said, 'You know the commandments of Moses, that is, you shall not kill, you shall not commit adultery, you shall not steal, you shall not bear false witness, honour your father and your mother.'[23] To this the other replied, as if about to walk away with credit for perfect righteousness, 'I have kept all these since my youth.' This comment was not much different from the one by the Pharisee in the parable, but it was quite different from the simplicity of children.

* * * * *

21 *quidam e magnatibus*. *Magnas* or *magnatus* 'great man, important man' is not a classical word but is found in the Vulgate Bible, eleven times in Ecclesiasticus and once in Judith. Erasmus uses it in place of the Vulgate's *princeps* 'leading man' here.

22 'The rich man' is introduced here from verse 23 below. The man's motive in questioning Jesus, and consequently the tone of Jesus' first reply, is variously explained in the exegetical tradition. Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 63 (64) PG 58 603 (on Matt 19:16–30) and Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 554A, followed by the *Gloss* (on 18:18), understand the man's question as an authentic inquiry about the way to heaven. They also, along with Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1878A–B, regard his use of the title 'good teacher' as corrected because it is insufficient, as if any human could be good compared to God, rather than disingenuous, condescending, or sarcastic. Erasmus' annotation *quid me dicis bonum* (on 18:19) says that the question in Luke is different from that at Matt 19:16, but adds that both sets of question and answer aim at the same point, that humans as humans can claim nothing good for themselves.

23 This summary of the Mosaic commandments follows the Vulgate order, not found in the Greek, in which the injunction against adultery follows that against murder, as it does in the parallels at Matt 19:18 and Mark 10:19; see Nestle-Aland on 18:20.

So one fault was exposed, but there was another lurking there too that made the man unfit for the kingdom of God. In order to bring it out Jesus said, 'You still lack one thing. If you want to enter the gospel kingdom, go, sell whatever you own, and lay up for yourself treasure in heaven by distributing your wealth to the poor. Free and unencumbered once that is done, come and follow me.' When the questioner heard that, he was grief-stricken, for he was very rich. He had not yet been conformed to the pattern of a child, for the love of riches was in possession of his heart.[24] But Jesus, seeing one go sadly away who was so eager for the bliss of the heavenly kingdom, yet without being able to despise the wealth of this world, turned to his disciples as if filled with amazement and said, 'How hard it will be for those who are burdened with riches to go through the narrow gate and into the kingdom of God![25] It is actually easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.'[26] Troubled by this remark, the disciples said, 'If no rich man enters, then who can be saved? For few are to be found who do not either have wealth or pursue it.' Jesus

* * * * *

24 Here and twice above Erasmus refers to the simplicity or innocence of a child, thus making a connection between this interchange and the preceding narration of the blessing of the children. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 554B, followed by the *Gloss* (on 18:19), also joins the two episodes.
The love of riches is cited as the man's predominant fault by Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 63 (64) PG 58 603–5 (on Matt 19:16–26), Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 555A–D, followed by the *Gloss* (on 18:26), and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1009D–1013A; the remedy is spiritual indifference, even more than actual divestiture. See Erasmus' amplification of verse 27 at the end of this paragraph.

25 In 'It will be' Erasmus follows the future-tense verbs in some Greek and Latin texts of 18:24; see Nestle-Aland on this verse.
Perhaps the comments of Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 555B, who speaks of the *angustum foramen acus* 'narrow eye of a needle,' and Hugh of St Cher (on 18:24–5) 241V, who reports an unverified story that 'the Needle' is the name of a small gate in the wall of Jerusalem where camels must be unloaded in order to pass through, led Erasmus to introduce here the spiritual 'narrow gate' (*angusta porta*) of Matt 7:13–14 and Luke 13:24. Cf also chapter 13 nn22, 23, 24 above.

26 In the annotation *per foramen acus transire* (on 18:25) Erasmus notes that the Greek text uses the same verb, εἰσελθεῖν, for 'entering' the eye of the needle and 'entering' the kingdom of heaven; he praises the Vulgate translator, however, for expressing the sense of the Greek by saying *transire* 'pass through' the eye of the needle. In this sentence he adopts the Vulgate *transire* while using for entry into the kingdom of heaven his own preference from the annotation, *ingredi* (instead of the Vulgate's *intrare*).

again soothed his followers'[27] distress, saying, 'What is impossible with mortals is possible with God. It is not within human powers to despise riches and the comforts that come in their train. But God bestows this loftiness of mind on those who through their simple believing show themselves fit for his gifts. Furthermore, whoever lays aside the love of money and regards it as something he will gladly leave behind when the reckoning of his eternal salvation requires, has ceased to be a rich man in God's eyes.'

The apostles, most of whom had left behind whatever they earlier possessed, formed a good hope from this remark. So Peter spoke on their behalf: 'Well now, we have left everything[28] behind and followed you, we have fulfilled what you required of the rich man.' Although what Peter and Andrew had left behind was very little indeed (they would have left more if they had had it), the Lord praised their readiness, and so that they would not regret what they had given up he showed that there is great gain in having discarded riches for the sake of the kingdom of God. Indeed, in place of despised perishable and worthless possessions, in this life the heart is enriched by heavenly goods and in the age to come it is repaid with everlasting bliss. The Lord spoke in this fashion: 'I assure you positively of this: not only will it be to your great gain to have left behind your bits and pieces[29] for my sake, but also whoever gives up home or parents or brothers or wife or children for the sake of the kingdom of God is going to receive in this life things far better and more numerous than what he gave up, and besides in the age to come will receive life eternal.'

When he had lifted the spirits of his disciples with these words, he took with him the twelve apostles, who needed to know everything that was being done for the salvation of the human race. And he began to impress upon them even more openly the death that he was knowingly and willingly going to meet at Jerusalem according to the sayings of the prophets. For he knew that they would be greatly upset by the death of their Lord, and he

* * * * *

27 The text of verse 26 actually says only 'those who were listening,' but the parallels at Matt 19:25–6 and Mark 10:24–7 make the disciples the audience at this point.

28 'Everything' is the language of 5:11, Matt 19:27, Mark 10:28, and older texts of 18:28. Modern texts of 18:28 have only 'our goods' or 'property'; see Nestle-Aland.

29 The poverty of the disciples and the scantiness of what they had left behind are highlighted by Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 857D–860A (also in the *Catena aurea* on 18:27–8) and Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 556A. Cyril and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1016A–B note that the heavenly reward is not proportionate to the amount of wealth renounced.

impressed this lesson on them more frequently so that it would eventually stick in their mind and they would gradually become accustomed to endure the thing of which their ears abhorred the very sound. And this indeed was not unbelief but a kind of passionate love for their teacher.[30] So apart from the others he indicated to them that the time of his death was near. 'Well now,' he said, 'we are going up to Jerusalem, and all the things that were written in the prophets about the Son of Man will be accomplished. For he is to be handed over to the gentiles, and he will be mocked and scourged and spat upon by them. And after they whip him and carry out every kind of abuse against him, then they will kill him, but on the third day he will rise again.'

But this lesson, since it was unwelcome, did not sink into the hearts of the apostles: so we believe with difficulty the things we do not want to be true. For they were not yet able to grasp the mystery of the cross, from which, in God's new plan, salvation for the world was going to come. They did not like to believe that a man so dear was going to die a violent death; and they could not believe that sinful men were going to kill one who could do so much by his marvellous deeds, one who had so often slipped out of the hands of his assailants; and finally, they had no doubt that it would be easier for him to prevent his own death than to come back to life after dying.[31] They also considered it better not to die at all than to be restored to life after death. What is more, though they could not doubt the trustworthiness of their Lord, they still soothed their feelings thus, and concluded that in these remarks of Jesus there was some figure of speech, of the kind the Lord generally used in his particular way, sometimes fooling not only the people with them but even the apostles themselves, as when he told them to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees; when he said in reply to their question that he had another food for which he hungered;

* * * * *

30 The frequency of Jesus' warnings to the disciples to prepare them for his passion and death, and the particular message that he would undergo those events knowingly and willingly are noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 65 (66) PG 58 617–18 (on Matt 20:17–19). Their unwillingness to believe what they hear is attributed to their love for their master by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 557D, followed by the *Gloss* (on 18:34) and with more emphasis Hugh of St Cher (on 18:34) 242v. Cf n32 below.

31 The representation of the disciples' overt reasons for disbelief has a rhetorical parallel in Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 65 (66) PG 58 618 (on Matt 20:17–18), who notes that they were disturbed by the sufferings Jesus foretold in light of the miracles they had seen, such as demoniacs cured and the dead returned to life, and so were disinclined to believe and unable to understand.

when he taught that a camel would pass through the eye of a needle more quickly than a rich man into the kingdom of heaven; when, indicating that his teaching was to be absorbed deep into the bowels of the soul, he said that no one would have life except him who had eaten Jesus' flesh and drunk his blood; when he promised that in three days he would restore the temple destroyed by the Jews.[32] With this sort of conjecturing they soothed their feelings; and indeed they did hear his remarks, but as if in sleep, and they did not have a deep understanding of the thrust of the remarks. This was as the circumstance required, the Lord allowing them to become gradually accustomed to what was going to be extremely bitter without fleeing prematurely from their teacher, from whose conversation they still had much to learn. They could not yet grasp the secrets of the divine plan, since the eyes of their mind were still darkened by much mist.[33]

But the others who were less intimate friends of the Lord were even more in the dark. Yet knowledge of Jesus is the wellspring of salvation. For to come to know him is to see. Faith[34] is light, earthly desires are darkness. And just here there was an incident to set before our eyes the way by which we can see Jesus, and in one blind man the pattern[35] is set forth by which blindness of heart can be lifted from many. Just one person with a defect in his bodily eyes came face to face with Jesus; but how many who saw much less in their heart were following him, after even the twelve still had eyes so blocked by the darkness of ignorance that they did not understand the Lord's perfectly intelligible statement!

* * * * *

32 This sentence contains a selection of Jesus' parabolic or enigmatic sayings; see, in order, Luke 12:1, John 4:32, Luke 18:25, John 6:53, John 2:19 (and as variously reported in the synoptics). Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 557D says that because Jesus customarily spoke in parables the disciples' love for him led them to believe that the talk of suffering and death was also allegorical; Bede is followed by the *Gloss* (on 18:34) and Hugh of St Cher (on 18:34) 242v. None of these, however, includes a sampling of parabolic remarks as the paraphrase does.

33 'Eyes of the mind' is a favourite figure of Erasmus'; see the General Index to the *Paraphrase on John* CWE 46. Here, as in the paraphrase on John 9:1 CWE 46 121, it is used as an introduction to a miracle involving a blind man.

34 'Faith' is *fides* here, but then *fiducia* four times until the paraphrase on Jesus' statement in verse 42. There Erasmus, like the Vulgate, uses *fides* and then uses it again in his expansion of the verse. He reverts to *fiducia* (translated 'confidence' the second time) twice more at the end of the verse. For Erasmus' thoughts on the blurring of the two terms, see chapter 17 n16.

35 *forma*. Erasmus had introduced the idea of *forma* with the echo of 2 Cor 3:18 in the paraphrase on verse 17; see n19 above. It recurs in the paraphrase on verse 23, 'the pattern of a child' (*pueri formam*).

It happened, then, that while Jesus was not far from Jericho on his way to Jerusalem, a blind man was sitting by the public road begging. When he grasped from the noise of voices and feet that a great number of people was passing, he asked what was going on (since this sort is all the more inquisitive because they are without sight). The reply made to him was that Jesus of Nazareth was passing by. He had formed his faith from the things he had heard about Jesus and so instantly called out, saying, 'Jesus son of David, have mercy on me!' He added some coaxing to his importunity, and that quite in the fashion of beggars. Then the crowd that was going ahead of Jesus scolded the blind man and told him to keep quiet, supposing that he was asking for ordinary charity and fearing that a scruffy fellow and a public beggar would be annoying to the Lord. But the more the crowd scolded, the more insistently the blind man called out, repeating the same thing: 'Jesus son of David, have mercy on me!' Since it was not possible for him to see Jesus, he raised his voice all the more, not knowing how far away the person he addressed was.

But Jesus, who at the first shout or two had appeared not to notice (in order to make the man's faith more evident) finally halted and had the blind man led up to him, so that he could summon the eyes of all to consideration of the miracle. When he had reached Jesus, the Lord asked him, 'What do you want me to do for you?' He knew perfectly well what the blind man wanted, but he was forcing a declaration of his trouble so that the miracle would be more evident.[36] For some people are in the habit of pretending blindness in order to get more, and perhaps there were quite a few in the crowd who dared hope for nothing other than a handout. For even the Lord, though a poor man in the world's sense, made contributions to the poor from what had been given to him by his friends.[37] But the

* * * * *

36 'Declaration of his trouble' translates *mali confessionem*, which could also mean 'admission of evil,' implying a moral confession. The exegetical tradition agrees that Jesus intended to make the miracle evident to as many as possible, and that he already knew what the blind man wanted and did not need to ask. However, it is the Greek commentators who say that Jesus' purpose in asking was to attract the onlookers' attention to the miracle. See Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 66 (67) PG 58 626 (on Matt 20:29–30), Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 864C–865A (also in the *Catena aurea* on 18:40), and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1017C. The Latin tradition says that Jesus' question is intended to incite the heart to continual prayer; see Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 2 PL 76 1084B–C, followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 558D–559A, the *Gloss* (on 18:41), and Hugh of St Cher (on 18:41) 243r.

37 Traditional exegesis, both Latin and Greek, observes that the blind beggar does not, as might be expected of him, ask for money. See the passages in the

blind man said with great confidence, 'Lord, make me recover my sight.'[38] In a few short words[39] he asked for what could not be accomplished by a mortal, never doubting that then and there Jesus both could do it, as being completely powerful, and would want to do it, as being completely merciful.

And in response to his unqualified faith Jesus restored his vision in a word, saying, 'Recover your sight. Your faith has made you whole.' He had caught sight of Jesus by faith before he could see him with his body's eyes. This is of course the faith that always gets its request from its most merciful Lord, this is the faith that in the midst of the darkness of sin still calls to Jesus by name from far away, asking him to have mercy. The knowledge of his misdeeds raises a clamour against the one who calls out so,[40] but the fire of faith raises its voice more piercingly. Our Lord Jesus loves beggars of this kind, and therefore sometimes postpones what is being asked for, so that the beggars may be deserving of more. In deepest darkness dwell those who worship stones and logs instead of God, those whose god is their money or their belly, those who are slaves to self-seeking or to lust, those who storm about in wars of passion.[41] If such people cannot yet approach Jesus because they cannot see him, at least, at the sound of people all over the world proclaiming Jesus' glory, they may ask, 'What is going on?' When they find out that Jesus is passing, may they not let the opportunity slip but may they weary his ears with their cry for mercy, and if the knowledge of

* * * * *

previous note. For Jesus' contributions to the poor, cf eg John 13:29 and the paraphrase on that verse CWE 46 165.

38 'Make me recover my sight' is *fac ut visum recipiam*. Jesus' answer in the paraphrase just below uses the same expression: *recipito visum* 'recover your sight.' (*Recipito* is a 'future' imperative, substituted for the Gospel's 'present' imperative; see chapter 17 n9.) In the annotation *ut videam, et respice* (on 18:41–2) Erasmus had observed that the same Greek verb, meaning *recipere visum*, is used in request and reply, and had wondered why the Latin translator chose to use two different Latin words.

39 'In a few short words' is literally *tribus verbis* 'in three words.' This is a common Latin idiom and does not refer to the three Greek words of the beggar's request.

40 The crowd that tries to hush the beggar's cries in verse 39 is the crowd of sins and carnal desires that interfere with prayer, according to Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 2 PL 76 1083B–C, followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 558C and Hugh of St Cher (on 18:39) 243r.

41 For worshipping stones and logs cf eg Exod 20:4, Lev 26:1, Jer 2:27, and the numerous violations of this injunction in the OT. On making money or the belly a god cf eg 1 Tim 6:10, Phil 3:19. Slavery to the passions is a common theme in the NT; cf eg 2 Pet 2:19.

their former misdeeds urges them to silence, let the cry of the trusting heart pound on his ears that much more urgently! Jesus is deaf to no one who asks with faith; in one word he can give what is asked for. He is passing indeed, but he will not pass by on the other side[42] if you lift your voice. Now the beggar was happy when Jesus halted at his voice. And is it any wonder if he who saw fit to go such a long way for a lost sheep halts at the sound of one calling his name? But the blind man is happier yet when he is led to Jesus. For now he is very near his salvation. And anyone who has approached the wellspring of all light cannot be blind for long. The Lord, the wellspring of all glory, does not spurn the beggar, yet the human sinner disdains his neighbour. When you have come face to face with Jesus, when you have withdrawn from yourself, there is no need for wordy speeches; just say what you want, but speak with confidence not in your merits but in his power and his goodness, and immediately your sight will return, along with your salvation.

For as soon as Jesus had said, 'See,' he saw, and he turned from a beggar into a follower of Jesus and a preacher of God's goodness. What is more, on beholding so remarkable a miracle, even the people gave glory to God.

Chapter 19

And this blind man to whom the Lord restored light quite aptly signifies the people of the gentiles. The Law did indeed offer some light to the Jews. The gentiles dwelt in the deepest darkness of ignorance, so much so that among them many did not believe that God exists at all, while others thought that there were countless gods, but more criminally wicked than humans themselves. Still others thought that God had no concern for human affairs. There were also those who regarded the sun and the moon as gods, and those who so regarded cattle, dogs, apes, and even those who so regarded leeks and onions. Among them were some who did not recognize permanent marriages but practised random copulation in the manner of the beasts of the field. There were those for whom it was an act of piety to have killed aged parents. There were those for whom it was lawful to

* * * * *

42 'Pass (by on the other side)' is *praeterire*, the verb in the Vulgate text and the paraphrase on verse 36. Cf also the story of the good Samaritan, especially 10:31, where the same verb is used. Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 2 PL 76 1084A–B elaborates at some length on the picture of Jesus in this episode passing and then stopping.

eat human flesh. There were those for whom it was a point of religion to sacrifice their best beloved children to a demon.[1] What is more deplorable than this blindness? And yet the blind man, lacking all virtues, was aware of Jesus as he passed by, Jesus whom the Jewish nation rejected when he came to them; and he lifted the voice of faith: 'Son of David, have mercy on me.' He forced Jesus to stop. He deserved to have a question put to him. He admitted his blindness, he revealed his prayer: 'Lord, let me see.' He received what he asked for simply. He turned from a worshipper of prodigies into a worshipper of Jesus, from a slave of demons and all vices into a disciple and follower of Jesus, from a public beggar and extorter of piddling handouts to a herald of God's power.[2]

Furthermore, this kind of example is repeatedly brought to bear upon the Jews, so that they may either repent of their unbelief or openly make it clear for the future that they deserved to be rejected because they refused to be healed. And just this figure was displayed at the entrance to the city of Jericho. But soon in the city itself a clearer example presented itself.[3] For when the Lord had entered and was going through

* * * * *

1 Another, even fuller, of Erasmus' lists of the gentiles' impious religious beliefs and practices; see the paraphrase on 15:13 and n19 above. To the references there may be added such parallels as these: pagan atheism or polytheism, Cicero *De natura deorum* 1.2 and 117, 2.60–70, Pliny *Naturalis historia* 30.16; worship of sun and moon, Herodotus 2.47 (by the Egyptians), Cicero *De natura deorum* 1.27–39 (by philosophers); random copulation, Herodotus 3.101 (who says of some Indian peoples that their 'copulation was in public view like cattle') and Diogenes Laertius 6.68 and 72 (of the Cynic philosopher Diogenes); the pious killing of parents, Euthyphro in Plato's dialogue of that name; cannibalism as a sacred or social duty, Herodotus 3.38 and 99 (of Indians), 4.26 (of Scythians), Pliny *Naturalis historia* 6.195 (the anthropophagi of the upper Nile valley); the sacrifice of children to demons, Lev 20:1–4, 2 Kings 3:27, 2 Chron 28:3, Ps 106:35–8 (of Jews who adopted the religious practices of their pagan neighbours).

2 Erasmus delays the expository analysis of the healing of the blind man reported in 18:35–43 until the beginning of the *Paraphrase*'s chapter 19. One reason might be to avoid blurring the dramatic effect of concluding the narrative and chapter 18 in a single stroke. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1882A–B, comparing the blind man and Zacchaeus at the break between the two narratives, made a similar kind of transition. Coming as it does in the middle of book 8 of Ambrose's work, however, it would not have been highlighted for either author or reader by the page format, whereas in the conceptual and physical framework implicit in Erasmus' writing of a book laid out by the chapters of the original Gospel, it is very obvious. See the next note.

3 With this sentence Erasmus begins a parallelism of the blind man of 18:35–

the middle of the city, hemmed in on all sides by a very dense crowd of all kinds of people, there was a man whose name, from his character, was Zacchaeus, afire with a passion for righteousness,[4] though he was first among the tax collectors and also very rich, and though neither that means of livelihood nor the indulgence of fortune adequately corresponded to this temperament. He, then, was seized by a great longing to see Jesus so that he could know by sight a man about whom people's talk had spread such marvellous tales. He believed and loved what he had heard, and therefore, just as in the prayer of Simeon and the patriarchs, out of a holy passion he desired to fill his eyes too with the blessed sight, and would have attempted greater things as well had not humility prevented him: and for this very reason he was worthier of having fuller access to Jesus.[5]

* * * * *

43, who as he has just said symbolizes the gentiles, with Zacchaeus, whom he will also present as a symbol of the gentiles; see the paraphrase on 19:1–10 below. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1881C–1882A had explained that the two blind men of Matt 20:29–34 represent the double ancestry of the gentiles (from the two sons of Noah), and that while there is only one blind man in the account in Luke 18, the figure of double ancestry is preserved in the story of Zacchaeus, for like the blind man he too represents the gentiles. Another strand of the tradition, from Gregory the Great *Hom in Evang* 2 PL 76 1082C, through Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 558C to the *Gloss* (on 18:35) takes the blind man to represent the human race. As for Zacchaeus himself standing for the gentiles who will be admitted to grace by belief in Jesus, this interpretation is proposed not only by Ambrose but also by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 559D and 561A, followed by the *Gloss* (on 19:1) and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:6) 243v–244r.

A separate question is whether Zacchaeus himself is a Jew or a gentile. Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 4.37 considers him a gentile. Ambrose and Bede do not make their views clear. Hugh of St Cher (on 19:7–8) 244v notes that some think he was a gentile. Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:9) quotes Bede and Ambrose on Zacchaeus' kinship with Abraham (in 19:9), apparently reading them to mean that he was a gentile but adds the explanation of 'others' that he was a Jew; the addition to Nicholas (on 19:9) says that Nicholas' reasoning is right and that Ambrose and Bede support this position too if correctly understood. Erasmus' use of Zacchaeus as a symbol of the gentiles and his pronounced polarization of Jews and gentiles in the paraphrase on 19:5–10 make it very easy to overlook his reticence about Zacchaeus' ethnic identity.

4 Jerome *De nominibus Hebraicis* CCL 72 138 says 'Zacchaeus' means 'justified' or 'righteous' or 'justifiable.' 'Justified' is also the meaning given by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 559D and repeated in the *Gloss* (on 19:1).

5 For the prayers of Simeon and the patriarchs see 2:25–32, Gen 46:30, Tob 11:16–17 (Vulg).

Herod too had long had a desire to see Jesus. He saw him and scorned him. For in vain does anyone see Jesus who is not seen by Jesus in turn. Jesus had seen Zacchaeus before being seen by him.[6] Herod desired to see a person who would delight the inquisitive eyes of the king by doing some miracle. Zacchaeus desired to see him in order to know who he was: surely the only Son of God, the source of complete salvation for all who trust in him. It is no great thing to see Jesus in the flesh, with the eyes with which the Pharisees viewed him every day and mocked him. But the eyes of the disciples are called blessed, for they earned the right to see what had been denied to many princes of the earth. Simon bar Jona was declared blessed for having seen who Jesus was when he made this pronouncement: 'You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.' The Jews had not seen who he was when they said, 'Isn't this the carpenter's son?'[7]

But Zacchaeus' sense of shame was an obstacle to his holy desire; the surrounding crowd of people was an obstacle to his crashing through to get to Jesus. The humbleness of his body was an obstacle. For he was quite small in stature. Those who apply themselves to mean and perishable matters are lowly (for anything this world has is lowly if it is compared to the majesty of the gospel). Jesus is not visible to such people unless they get themselves up onto a height. When Jesus is on high he will not be seen except by lowly people. When he is mixed in with a lowly and common crowd he is only seen by those who have trampled the summit of human affairs beneath their feet. And therefore in order to be visible to all the little people everywhere in the world, he himself later climbed the high wood of the cross.[8] So Zacchaeus, a little man not only in his physical stature but also in the humility of his heart, wanted to see the lowly Jesus from on high; he ran ahead and got a place where[9] Jesus was sure to pass. A raised place was offered by the tree called sycomore (which bears a particular kind of

* * * * *

6 For Herod see 9:9, 23:8, and 23:11. For being seen by Jesus before seeing him, cf John 1:48.

7 For the eyes of the disciples cf 10:23–4 and Matt 13:16; for Simon bar Jona's declaration, Matt 16:16–17; and for the carpenter's son, Matt 13:55.

8 Cf John 3:14–15, 12:32, and the paraphrases on those passages CWE 46 48 and 155.

9 In using the relative *qua* '(by) which way,' '(by) where,' Erasmus follows his observation in the annotation *quia inde* (on 19:4) that *inde* 'from there' is a translator's mistake for *illac* '(by) that way,' '(by) there' in the Vulgate translation of ἐκείνης '(by) that way.' Valla *Annot in Lucam* 19 had made the same point.

fig and so is also called the Egyptian fig, though in its foliage it resembles the mulberry tree).[10]

The crowd of Jews encircled Jesus in their midst. The Law had gone before him, the prophets had gone before him; on every side that generation pressed him close. Even today the Jewish nation follows, learns what Jesus did and taught, and still cannot see who this Jesus is from whom it ought to hope for salvation. Zacchaeus runs ahead and gets this bliss first, surely symbolizing the gentiles. What is the reason? Because the Jew is still at ground level and clinging to the flesh of the Law. But Jesus is only seen by those who raise themselves from the lowly letter of the Law to the higher sense of the spirit. From this raised place it is possible to see who Jesus is and where he is. Otherwise, if you stay mixed in with the crowd, that is, if you have no special wisdom, you often hear that deceiving phrase, 'Look, Christ is here; look, he is there.' The Pharisees cry out, 'Look, here is Jesus.' The Sadducees cry out, 'Look, he is here.' The Ebionites cry out, 'Look, he is here.'[11] One shows us somebody of the pharisaic class in a dark robe and says, 'Behold, here is Christ.' Another again indicates somebody else in a white robe and says, 'Look, here is Christ.' Another, indicating various shapes and colours of garments, cries out, 'Here is Christ.' Another points

* * * * *

10 Erasmus' annotation *in arborem sycomorum* (on 19:4) learnedly discusses the medical, botanical, and other Greek and Latin sources that establish to his satisfaction the identity between the Vulgate's *sycomorus* here and the Greek text's συκομορέα, and between the tree thus identified and the συκαμίνος (Vulg *arbor morus* 'mulberry tree') of 17:6. The three points of description here, an unusual kind of fig, the name 'Egyptian fig,' and foliage like the mulberry, can all be found in Pliny, *Naturalis historia* 13.56, and the identification by some of sycamine, sycomore, and mulberry in Celsus *De medicina* 3.18.12. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 560B, followed by the *Gloss* (on 19:4) and elaborated by Hugh of St Cher (on 19:4) 243V, says that the sycomore is like the mulberry in foliage but tall, and that its name means 'foolish fig.' Erasmus will pick up the latter idea in his allegorical explanation two paragraphs below; see n15 below.

11 Cf Jesus' warnings against those who will falsely proclaim the coming of the Christ or the Son of Man in 17:23, Matt 24:23–5, Mark 13:21. The Ebionites were a sect of Jewish Christians, often regarded as heretical, against whom Erasmus had said the Gospel of John was aimed. See the dedicatory letter prefacing the *Paraphrase on John* CWE 46 11, and eg the article 'Ebionites' in the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* 3rd ed F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingston (Oxford 1997) or Jaroslav Pelikan *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* I (Chicago 1971) 24.

to a fish eater and says, 'Here is Christ.' Another shows us a eunuch and says, 'Here is Christ.' O Jewish and unbelieving generation! Do you want to see Jesus? Climb the tree, borrow the eyes of a Zacchaeus.[12] He does not want to see Jesus' clothes; he longs to recognize his face. This face is veiled in Sacred Scripture. Remove the veil, raise your understanding to the things within, and you will see Jesus. You will see from whence comes our true salvation.[13] The Pharisee walks with his head high, aloof, self-satisfied, claiming as his own both righteousness and knowledge of the Law. And as long as he thinks himself more than adequately great and near to Christ, he does not see fit to employ the resources of the tree. But Zacchaeus, a lowly person in his own eyes, both climbed the tree and saw what he wished for.[14]

* * * * *

12 This passage, from 'One shows us,' was censured by Noël Béda, syndic of the Paris faculty of theology. In his *Supputatio* LB IX 613E–615F (1527) Erasmus replied vigorously to Béda's objections, which centered on the criticisms implied here of contemporary monks, friars, and priests. He says that Béda is mistaking the narrator's, that is, Luke's, voice for the voice of Erasmus himself, and that he removes the passage from its context, where it only represents Jesus' frequent criticisms of Jewish superstitions, to misapply it to modern conditions and draw unwarranted conclusions about Erasmus' rejection of monasticism. This is at least in part disingenuous. Erasmus regularly ridiculed the superstitious belief that special vows or dress or ostentatious adherence to outward forms of religion guaranteed special favour with God. Samples of his mocking treatment of dark robes (worn by Franciscans), white robes (worn by Carthusians and Dominicans), multicoloured robes (worn by Crutched Friars), and fish eating and vows of chastity (common to all professed religious) can be found eg in the section on monks and friars in the *Praise of Folly* CWE 27 130–2 and in such colloquies as Γεροντολογία 'The Old Men's Chat' CWE 39 456–8, Πτωχοπλουσία 'The Well-to-do-Beggars' CWE 39 476–82, and *Exequiae seraphicae* 'The Seraphic Funeral' CWE 40 996–1032. See also the closing of the *Enchiridion* CWE 66 126–7, against the belief that taking monastic vows is a superior form of Christianity. For an overview of Erasmus' opinions on monasticism and the reaction they provoked, see Erika Rummel '*Monachatus non est pietas*: Interpretations and Misinterpretations of a Dictum,' in *Erasmus' Vision of the Church* ed Hilmar Pabel, Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies 33 (Kirksville, MO 1995) 41–56.

13 At the end of the *Paraclesis* (1516) LB V 144C–D, his exhortation to the study of the Bible, Erasmus makes a similar contrast, often cited, between superstitious reverence for Jesus' garments, or statues and representations of him, and the real sight of him afforded by attentive reading of Scripture, so real that it is better than meeting him during his earthly ministry would have been. For the 'veil' of Scripture, cf 2 Cor 3:14–16.

14 Cf 18:9–14 and the paraphrase there.

And perhaps this tree was like the fig that the Lord cursed because in the greenness of its leaves it promised to him when he was hungry fruit it did not have, and now, after the figures of the Law, after the predictions of the prophets, it was time for it to bear the fruit of gospel godliness. This was the fig that the master had ordered completely cut down unless manure was applied and it ceased being barren; and it almost would have been barren, if Zacchaeus had not climbed it. The stock of the Jewish fig yielded tasteless and unripe figs; but when Zacchaeus climbed the tree, when the people of the gentiles was ingrafted, then it began to bear the fruit that our Lord Jesus loves.[15] For many generations he had been looked for by the Jews; at last he came to them. He walked in their midst, and they did not recognize him.[16] The people of the gentiles had only heard of Jesus' fame, and afire with a passion to make the acquaintance of the one whom the Jews hanged on the tree they rushed forward in a blaze of faith; acknowledging their own unrighteousness, in meekness they spurned the letter of the Law, spurned the ceremonies and figures that the Jews embrace as true even today, and with the help of the gospel faith, with spiritual eyes they perceive him passing by among the apostles and recognize that it is Jesus. Of their own accord they earn the right to have as a guest the one whom the unbelief of the Jews had banished.

Meanwhile Zacchaeus the little is sitting in the tree, waiting and watching intently for Jesus' arrival, not yet informed as to the mark by which he

* * * * *

15 Jesus curses a barren fig at Matt 21:18–19; he tells the parable of the master and the barren fig at 13:6–9; cf the paraphrase above. The useless figs of the Jewish stock may owe something to the dream of baskets of good and bad figs in Jeremiah 24, and something as well to the reports in Strabo *Geography* 17.2.4 and Dioscorides *De materia medica* 1.127 that the fruit of the sycamine looks like a fig but does not taste good – hence the name *συκόμορος* or 'foolish fig.' See n10 above. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1881D–1882A calls Zacchaeus a wild graft onto a domestic olive, alluding to Paul's metaphor for the gentiles in Rom 11:13–24, and at 1883C says that Zacchaeus in the sycomore is the strange new fruit of the new era, fulfilling the prophecy of Song of Sol 2:13 'the fig tree puts forth its figs,' for, says Ambrose, Christ came that not fruit but human beings might be born from trees, an allusion to the spiritual rebirth resulting from a human's belief in the crucified and resurrected Jesus, 'the fruit that our Lord Jesus loves.' Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 865D–868A, on the other hand, connects the 'foolish fig,' which he takes as producing no figs at all, with the seeming 'foolishness' of Christian life, as in 1 Cor 1:18–30. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 560B–561D also refers to 1 Corinthians 1 but suggests that spiritual righteous living is the fruit of the sycomore.

16 Cf John 1:10.

would be able to recognize him, except that he hoped for what he passionately desired. But when they reached the sycomore, perhaps Zacchaeus was an object of derision to many of the Jews, a rich tax collector high in a tree, watching one man! For he did not want to make the acquaintance of anyone except Jesus alone. But Jesus was delighted by the man's remarkable longing, which he displayed in his very action, in his expression and gaze. Although he had seen Zacchaeus earlier,[17] nonetheless, in order to point out to the Jews an example of ready belief, he raised his eyes and looked at him. Now, believe me, whenever Jesus favours someone with his glance you are to expect some remarkable saving act. For his eyes have a salvific enchantment. Zacchaeus had only been eager to look at him, but in vain does anyone look at Jesus if Jesus does not in turn favour him with his gaze. Remove yourself from lowly and mean matters, and Jesus will look up at you. His look has something about it that bodes well, but there is more happiness in hearing his voice. For when Zacchaeus was doing nothing more than looking at Jesus, the Lord spontaneously spoke to him, even addressing him by name as an acquaintance: 'Zacchaeus, climb down quickly, for I must stay at your house today.'

We have read that the Lord often went to dinner parties when asked, but we have never read that he spontaneously included himself without an invitation, and doing so is commonly regarded as less than courteous. But the Lord had looked deep within the disposition of him to whom it was so important to see Jesus passing by. The man would have tried more things if his sense of impropriety had not prevented him. He thought to himself, 'Happy are those whose lot it is to be associated with such a man, to look upon his countenance face to face, to hear the man's voice at close hand. This is the Jews' good fortune. I am a tax collector. For me it is quite enough to have seen him passing by.' No word of invitation had been issued, but a heart like this was a most civil inviter; our Lord Jesus loves to be invited in this way. One who does not, out of awareness of his own frailty, dare to ask for what he secretly wants gets more than one who summons Jesus

* * * * *

17 'Although he had seen Zacchaeus earlier' is not a part of the Gospel narrative. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1883A–B remarks that Zacchaeus had gone above commonplace ignorance and so deserved to see the one he longed for; at 1883C he compares Nathanael, whom Jesus saw before Nathanael saw him (John 1:48), with Zacchaeus. Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 865B says that Jesus had already seen Zacchaeus with his divine sight; Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1020C–D observes that Jesus saw Zacchaeus first, for he always anticipates when we are eager for him.

to him as if to put him under obligation. For Peter never came nearer to Jesus than when he said, 'Depart from me, Lord, for I am a sinful man.' Also a compelling inviter was the man who said, 'Lord, I am not worthy that you should enter under my roof,' for the Lord was already in his house when his boy was being healed.[18] Wherever salvation is, Jesus is there. Jesus thirsted for the salvation of the gentiles, and so he bade Zacchaeus climb down quickly. The time had now come for salvation to move from among the Jews and pass over to the church of the gentiles, for there Jesus must remain until the consummation of the ages, because he was not permitted to remain among the Jews. He had spied Jesus from high overhead by faith, he climbed down to the duties of godliness; it is not enough to contemplate Jesus when Jesus is in need of a hospitable reception, and he is in need whenever one's neighbour is in need.

But now, what about Zacchaeus? He said not a word in answer, for great emotion usually takes away the voice, but he obeyed without hesitation. He climbed down quickly, for it will not do to hesitate when Jesus calls us. The Jews were summoned and made their excuses;[19] Zacchaeus in joy and gladness welcomed Jesus to his house. Oh, wretched synagogue, that destroyed Jesus its guest! Oh, blissful house of the church, that by its readiness summoned to itself Jesus the source of all bliss!

You see the beginning of the church gathered from the gentiles; now observe the depiction of Jewish spite. When the crowd saw Jesus so favourably inclined towards a tax collector that he was spontaneously inviting himself to the man's house, it grumbled because he had stopped off to visit a sinful man. Oh, righteousness defiled and hateful to God, that prefers to sneer rather than be healed, that prefers to be jealous of a neighbour rather than share with him! 'Visiting a sinful man!' they said, as if the chief sin of all were not to be jealous of one's neighbour, and as if one who begrudges his brother's salvation could be a good man! Jealous Jew, why do you stand outside the doors of the church? You too are permitted to enter. But even if you refuse, Jesus has still decided to stay at Zacchaeus' house. The gentiles glory in such a guest, whom they had not expected. And it is even more welcome for this reason, that the event is not only more than they deserve but also more than they expected. As there was grumbling

* * * * *

18 Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1882A–B, followed by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 19:5), says that Jesus had heard the inner longing of one who wanted to invite him, though he had heard no words of invitation. For the two parallels given see 5:8 and 7:6–7.

19 Cf 14:15–24.

now against Jesus because of Zacchaeus, so there was grumbling later on against Peter because of Cornelius the centurion: 'Why did you visit uncircumcised men?'[20]

But what was happening meanwhile? Zacchaeus, ignoring the grumbling of the Jewish people, stood before Jesus, now desiring even to be admitted into the group of disciples, showing how far he had already advanced. For he said to Jesus, 'Look, Lord, I give half of my goods to the poor, and if I have cheated anyone in any way, I pay back quadruple.' Are you listening, Pharisee? Zacchaeus does not mention sacrifices, dietary restrictions, fasts, holy days, sabbaths, ritual bathing; he does not boast of his dress or his race. Instead he brings up works of charity. In these the sinner surpasses the righteous, and the tax collector excels those who brag about their own sanctimony. Indeed, the Pharisee who proclaimed his own benefactions gave only a tenth of his goods to the poor.[21] This man gave a half, and not from ill-gotten gains, but whatever had been acquired by cheating he refunded at a quadruple rate; then of the rightful profits he bestowed half on the needy. Oh, amazing reversal of human affairs! The Pharisees' inner parts were full of rapine and trickery; and then we have a righteous and generous Zacchaeus, not only a rich man but a tax collector, and in so far as he was a leader of this class, he was even more abhorrent to the Jews. But the Lord does not trouble himself about labels; he looks at the intention and he values according to the deeds, that is, those deeds that proceed from faith and love. And Zacchaeus was not making these statements about himself boastfully, like that Pharisee, trumpeter of his own righteousness before God and scoffer at the tax collector. Zacchaeus did not put his own righteousness before that of another person but as a sinful man and a tax collector simply disclosed that he had had a zeal for righteousness even before he saw Jesus, from whom he wanted to learn whether he had acted rightly or not, and what else would have to be done besides in order to attain eternal life. It was profitable for Zacchaeus' words to be heard in this way by the jealous Jews, and also in their hearing to be approved by Christ. For he could use no more effective means of rebuking the deceitfulness, greed, and rapacity of these people, who not only gave nothing to a neighbour in need but even, on grounds of piety, cheated their parents out of the support owed them by their sons.[22]

* * * * *

20 Cf Acts 11:1–3, referring to Acts 10. This incident is cited in comment on verse 7 by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 561B and the *Gloss* (on 19:7).

21 Cf 18:11–12.

22 There is an implicit comparison of Zacchaeus with the rich man of 18:18–23, or more closely with the rich young man in Matt 19:16–22 and Mark 10:17–22.

So Jesus turned to the grumbling Jews[23] and said, 'I tell you that today salvation has come to this household because it too belongs to father Abraham, in whom you boast as the ancestor of your race. For whoever reflects Abraham in faith and simplicity of life and godliness is a son of Abraham, a sharer in the blessing promised to Abraham long ago.[24] Ancestry other than from the stock of Abraham is no obstacle to this, nor is a type of life formerly spent in sin. Whoever repents of his earlier life and embraces the gospel teaching, whoever follows in the footsteps of Abraham and pursues true righteousness, is a son and heir of Abraham. And the Son of Man will not despise people of this kind, for he has come into the world for this very purpose, to seek for what had strayed, to save what had been lost.[25] These sinners are more pleasing to God than people who are swollen-headed with the false conviction of their own righteousness.'

In these words Jesus made it clear that thereafter there was to be no glorying in observance of the Law, but that whatever endowment may have fallen to us from the bounty of heaven is to be entirely applied to drawing as many people as possible to salvation. For it is in this kind of gain that God, who had sent his Son to unite all the nations of the world to himself by freely forgiving their sins, takes special pleasure. Yet there were some even among the disciples who supposed that soon, when he got

* * * * *

For the obligation of charity to neighbour and parents see the story of the good Samaritan (10:30–7) and Matt 15:4–6.

23 In fact the Gospel text of verse 9 says that Jesus 'said to him,' that is, to Zacchaeus. In the annotation *eo quod et ipse filius sit Abrahae* (on 19:9) Erasmus had said that the Gospel's third-person remark 'since he is also a son of Abraham' is rather hard to understand, particularly because Jesus had not turned to the others and addressed the remark to them. He suggested that the Greek 'son of Abraham' did not mean Zacchaeus but the 'house' of the first part of the sentence, the Greek text's word for 'house' being masculine. In the paraphrase he both adds the missing turn to the audience of onlookers and makes clear that the household (*familia*) belongs to Abraham, though the 'son of Abraham' familiar from the Vulgate shows up in the next sentence of the paraphrase; he thus accommodates his dramatic sense, his philological observation, and the expectations of readers of the Latin Bible.

24 Cf John 8:31–47 and the paraphrase on that section in CWE 46 113–17. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 561D–562A, echoed by the *Gloss* (on 19:9), explains that Zacchaeus is pronounced a son of Abraham not because of his ancestry but because he has imitated Abraham's faith; he adds additional explanations based on Galatians 3 and Romans 4. See the paraphrases on those chapters in CWE 42 107–14 and 26–32, and the paraphrase on Acts 7:2 CWE 50 49 and n6.

25 Cf Matt 10:6 and 15:24, 1 Tim 1:15, and 1 Pet 2:25.

to Jerusalem (and he was already close to it), the kingdom of heaven, of which he had so often made mention, would appear. They imagined that it was some kingdom like an earthly one, while Christ meant the kingdom of the gospel spirit, through which the tyranny of sin is crushed. And that kingdom does not consist in troops, arms, or force, but in faith in God, in kindness towards one's neighbour, in mercy, in sincere and open-handed stewardship of the gospel word.

[His words] likewise [made clear] that the majesty of that kingdom, majesty that will adorn the godly with undying glory and sentence the ungodly to everlasting punishment, is not going to be produced right away but is to be brought forth in its own time, which is unknown to us. For now, every means must be employed to make each person remember first that whatever gift he has is money belonging to the Lord, to whom we owe everything; and it is for his gain that whatever we have received is to be spent in good faith – not that the Lord is in need of any material object but because in accordance with his love for the human race he thirsts for the salvation of all, and thinks himself enriched by a great gain if one person repents of his sins at another person's urging and is converted to the desire for gospel godliness. The result is that the Lord has a reward for both, the one who by his kindness provided help and the one who was helped. And there is no reason for us to claim for ourselves praise or thanks for such service. We are all slaves; our labour is owed to our master.[26] The entire share belongs to him to whom we ourselves belong. Each one need only do his part in striving to increase the master's property; let him leave the decision about reward to the master, who in his own time will repay our ready will and faithful effort most generously.[27]

The parable goes like this: 'A well-born and powerful man set out for distant parts to claim for himself a kingdom that another had tyrannically seized, and when that was accomplished to return home.[28] But before he

* * * * *

26 Cf 17:10.

27 This typical anticipatory explication of the meaning of the next parable follows Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 868D–869D, Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1024C–D, and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:11) 244V, who all note that the parable is intended at least in part to refute the notion that Jesus' kingdom will be an earthly one. See also n33 below. Cyril and Hugh (on 19:13) 245R also understand the pounds to be the gifts of grace; cf Erasmus' 'endowments ... from the bounty of heaven.'

28 The 'kingdom that another had tyrannically seized' will be identified below as the church of the gentiles; see the paraphrase on verse 26. In that regard Erasmus follows a largely Latin exegetical tradition: Augustine *Quaestiones evan-*

began his journey he called together the ten slaves he owned and handed over to them ten pounds equally divided among them, and at the same time he gave them his instructions. "I am giving you this money," he said, "not so that you can be wasteful or keep it idle at home but so that it can grow in business dealings, with the expectation, of course, that when I come back I will find the worth of my house increased." With his household affairs thus arranged he set off.

'Now the citizens of the city he governed hated him. So once he had departed they began to foment revolution, scheming to shut him out of the kingdom he possessed while he was establishing his claim to another one. They therefore sent spokesmen to him after his departure to tell him that the citizens were of a mind not to have him as king thereafter; he was not to come back from his present destination. But it turned out that when he had claimed the kingdom on whose account he had made the journey he did come back; and promptly had his slaves summoned, the ones to whom he had given shares of the ten pounds, with the intention of balancing the accounts and finding out how much profit each one had made. The first one came forward, who, on being asked for his account, said, "Master, your pound has increased to ten pounds." Praising his energy and trustworthiness, the master replied, "Well done, good servant; since you showed yourself faithful in a small amount of money and affectionate towards your master when my circumstances were somewhat straitened, now that my circumstances are improved it is right for you to be a sharer in my greater good fortune. Accept the governorship of ten cities." After him the second slave came, who, on being asked for his account, said, "Master, the pound of yours that you gave me as my share has yielded you five pounds." The master praised this man's energy also, though it was not as great. "In proportion to your energy," he said, "you too are to be a governor, of five cities." In this fashion the others too rendered their accounts and were each rewarded with a position in proportion to his capability.

'At last there came one slave, the laziest and least reliable of them all, who when his master asked for his account answered, "Here, master, I will return to you the pound you entrusted to me. I have kept it all this time put away in a handkerchief so that it would be safe for you just as it

* * * * *

geliorum 2.46, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 561D, the *Gloss* (on 19:12), and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:12) 244V. None of these includes a reference to the gentiles' subjection to Satan, such as Erasmus suggests here and states explicitly in the paraphrase on verse 26; but cf 4:6 and the paraphrase there.

was. Far from wasting it, I didn't even lay a finger on it. I preferred this to running risks with it, so that, if business turned out badly, there would be no trouble between you and me. For I was afraid of you, well aware that you are a harsh man and greedy for gain, so much so that you not only make no gifts of your own possessions but you even draw out from places where you have put nothing in and gather the harvest from places where you have not sown a crop."

'The master, not only displeased at the laziness of the slave but also enraged that he defended his guilt by his master's practices, said, "Good-for-nothing servant, untrustworthy and a slanderer of your master besides, you have pronounced sentence on your own head.[29] You knew, as you say, that I am a harsh man and greedy for gain, withdrawing where I have not deposited and reaping where I have not sown! This very fact ought to have roused you to exert yourself and to hand my money over to the bankers. For without a doubt I would have come and gotten it[30] from you with interest, because I entrusted it to you precisely so that in your hands it would grow." When the useless slave had nothing to say to his master's words, the master said to the other slaves who were standing there, "Take the pound from him and give it to the one who has ten pounds." The other slaves said in surprise, "Master, what need is there to give it to him? He is rich enough! He has ten pounds." Then the master said, "What he has is no concern of yours.[31] This is what I decided is best, and this is what is fair in the present settling of accounts: if anyone has increased his master's property by his faithful exertions, my kindness should add something so that he is even better supplied. On the other hand, far from my generosity assisting the poverty of one who through laziness has made no gain for himself, even what he has is to be taken away. The share belonged to me, the profit was owed to me; your task was to provide your obligatory service. Now I bestow on you both your share and the profit from it."'

* * * * *

29 Hugh of St Cher (on 19:22) 245v says that this slave is shown to be guilty on two counts: his wrongdoing in not following instructions and the veiled criticism of his master in the excuse he makes.

30 'It' is *eam*, a feminine pronoun in Latin because it picks up the feminine *pecunia* 'money.' In the annotation *exegissem illud* (on 19:23) Erasmus had said that the *illud* (neuter) ought to have been *illam* (feminine), a reading he did find in two manuscripts; the translator, he suggested, had forgotten that he had just used a Latin feminine word to express the Greek neuter word for 'money.' The paraphrase has the correction.

31 Cf John 21:22, Jesus' rebuke to Peter's curiosity about John's fate.

Up to this point in the riddle Jesus taught his disciples that each one was to show himself as faithful and diligent as possible in the business of preaching the gospel, but that they were to look for their reward in the Lord's second coming, when he will appear at last mighty and sublime, with the kingdom of the church then claimed as his own and handed over to his Father. For known as God at first only in Judea,[32] he appeared to be the ruler of only one community, while the devil ruled unchecked in a kingdom that did not belong to him, throughout all the nations of the world. But desiring to assert his claim, through the preaching of the gospel, to what Satan had seized through tyranny, he left the land of the Jews and set out on his way to heaven, though only after first equipping his disciples for the task of the gospel business. For he entrusted to them the stewardship of the gospel word as a kind of share from which a huge profit would accrue, through their efforts, to a master who is quite greedy for such profits. They were to draw to the gospel kingdom whomever they could: tax collectors, prostitutes, soldiers, Greeks, Romans, Scyths, Gauls, Goths, Sarmatians. And they were to do this until the Lord's return, for he is going to return at the end of this world, to give out to each person eternal rewards for his deeds. But he will not return unless he has first subjected the world to the rule of the gospel and all the nations of the whole world come together into one church.[33]

Now while he carried this out through his disciples, the Jews, among whom alone thus far God seemed to reign (because of their knowledge of the Law and the authority of their religion) the Lord's fellow citizens, from whom and among whom he had been born, though they ought chiefly to have loved him and to have been at his service in every way in the claiming

* * * * *

32 Cf Ps 76:1–2.

33 The closing interpretation of the parable is not only fuller than the initial one (cf n27 above) but somewhat different in content. In the exegetical tradition, as here, the parable is taken to symbolize the first coming, departure into heaven (variously connected with the reception of the gentiles), and second coming of Christ: Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 868D, Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.46, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 562D–563A, the *Gloss* (on 19:11 and 12), and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:12) 244V. Erasmus leaves aside his earlier equation of pounds and gifts for an equation of pounds and the gospel mission to the world, and now takes the slaves as the disciples and their successors, instead of 'us' or everyone. Similar interpretations are found in Cyril 873B–D and 876A, Bede, followed by the *Gloss* (on 19:13), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1024D–1025C, and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:13) 245R. Augustine and the *Gloss* (on 19:26) include, as Erasmus does not, a reference to the return of Christ so that all Israel may be saved (Rom 11:26.)

of his kingdom, not only did not supply any aid but even stood in his way, shouting out in front of the Roman governor, 'We have no king but Caesar!' They did the same thing later also, beating the apostles and then forbidding them to mention Jesus' name ever again. They wanted Moses as king, they did not want Christ, for they hated him because he opposed their base lusts.[34]

Furthermore, even today we see how the Jewish nation has removed itself from the gospel kingdom, and how with stubborn hatred it has conspired against him to whom every power in heaven and on earth has been given by the Father.[35] 'We do not want,' they say, 'this man to be king over us,' and while they do not want to be slaves to Christ they are enslaved by every tyrant of this world, they are enslaved by Satan, the most savage tyrant. And though they see Christians everywhere in the whole world rejoicing in the freedom of the Spirit, they themselves even now keep their teeth fastened in the tasteless letter [of the Law], to which they are enslaved like serfs bound to the soil. But they cry out their protests in vain; the kingdom of the church is being claimed and strengthened, and all those who have supplied faithful service in preparing and establishing it will be crowned with glory and honour in the heavenly kingdom, in proportion to the gain which they have gathered in the vineyard of the Lord. But what will be the reward of stubbornly unbelieving Jews? The Lord explained this too in the remaining part of the parable.

'For after he had inflicted punishment on the untrustworthy slave, he added, "And furthermore, those citizens of mine – citizens in birth, enemies at heart, who sent out the mutinous delegation and sought an end to my kingship – bring them here so they may be killed in my sight and pay me the penalty for their rebelliousness." This is the eternal death that awaits all who do not heed the gospel of the Son of God. For on the last day they will

* * * * *

34 The identification Erasmus makes here between the 'fellow citizens' of verse 14 and the Jews, and between the 'enemies' of verse 27 and the Jews, is also found in Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 872A–B and 876A–B, Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.46, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 562D and 566C, followed by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 19:14 and 27), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1024D–1025C, Hugh of St Cher (on 19:14 and 27) 245r and 246r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:14). Cyril and Hugh include the quotation 'We have no king but Caesar' from John 19:15. For the apostles' being beaten by the Jews and forbidden to speak in Jesus' name, see Acts 5:40.

35 This echoes Matt 28:18; the following sentence opens with a quotation of Luke 19:14, paraphrased above.

deservedly find implacable the one whom they stubbornly scorned when he was gentle and merciful.'[36]

So saying the Lord continued on his way to Jerusalem, where he would complete that extraordinary sacrifice for the salvation of the human race, and from the watchtower of the cross, like a greedy and ambitious king, draw all things to himself.[37] For though there have been and will be many people everywhere to cry out in response to these very actions, 'We do not want this man as king over us,' there is still no nation so distant from the Jews that from it he will not draw very many to himself. So again he impressed on them by his action what he had earlier signified in the case of Zacchaeus, what soon afterwards he disclosed in a lengthier parable. At this present time the Lord took measures to make clear what he had often been careful to make clear before as well, that he deliberately and knowingly, of his own free will, suffered whatever he was going to suffer, and was in any case able to do whatever he wanted. He had determined to claim for himself the height of glory among humankind by means of the height of shame and humiliation, but the disciples, not yet fully capable of this mystery, were expecting from the Lord something grand and brilliant in the world's eyes. So he wanted to soothe, or, better, to make light of, their feelings briefly before his death, and to mock the glory of this world, showing how empty and unreliable it is when so much applause, such complimentary titles, so much popular enthusiasm is quickly followed by a cross.[38]

* * * * *

36 See n34 above. One strand of the exegetical tradition, represented by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 566C, the interlinear *Gloss* (on 19:27), Hugh of St Cher (on 19:27) 246R, and Nicholas of Lyra (*moraliter* on 19:14), explains the condemned enemies as not only the Jews but all unbelievers or bad Christians.

37 The 'watchtower of the cross' from which Jesus will 'draw all things to himself' (John 12:32; see the paraphrase on that verse CWE 46 155) alludes to the meaning of the name Zion 'watchtower' given by Jerome *De nominibus Hebraicis* CCL 72 108, 112, and elsewhere, and cited by Erasmus in the tropological interpretation of this episode, 152 below. Jerome also calls Jerusalem the citadel (or peak) of the watchtower at the outset of his comment on this episode in *Comm in Matthaeum* 21 PL 26 152A. The 'greedy and ambitious king' is an ironic restatement of the untrustworthy slave's excuse in 19:21; see the paraphrase on that verse. Erasmus also compares Paul to 'ambitious kings' in the paraphrase on Acts 16:3 CWE 50 101.

38 Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 66 PG 58 629 (on Matt 21:1–11) says that Jesus made this grand entry into Jerusalem in part to comfort the disciples in the face of his imminent death and to display his free choice to die.

Thus when Jesus reached the mount called Olivet, close to the two little towns located on the side of the hill,[39] where Jerusalem was already in sight, he sent two of his disciples out with instructions: 'Go,' he said, 'into the small town you see straight ahead. On entering it you will find a colt tied to a donkey before a house door, still unbroken to the saddle and on which no person has sat.[40] Untie it and bring it to me. If anyone stops you, saying, "Why are you untying the colt?" you are to answer like this: "The Lord has need of it."'

The disciples went off and found the colt tied up.[41] They started to untie it. Right away there were people there who asked, as if to stop them, 'Why are you untying the colt?' The disciples replied as they had been told, 'The Lord has need of it.'[42] On hearing the word 'Lord' they let the colt be taken away. So they brought it to Jesus. But when they saw that the Lord meant to mount, something he had never been in the habit of doing before, the disciples spread their cloaks over the beast so that he would not sit too uncomfortably on its bare back. In fact, once Jesus was seated and on his way, some even spread their garments on the road, either to honour him or

* * * * *

39 Erasmus drops the names of the two towns found in verse 29 but fills them in below, in his tropological exposition (151–2).

40 The Latin tradition pointed out that only Matt 21:2 mentions the she-donkey; so Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1885C, followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 567C and the *Gloss* (on 19:30) and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:30) 246V. Erasmus said in the annotation *pullum asinae* (on 19:30) that the Greek text of Luke, unlike the Latin, mentions only the colt, not its dam. Besides retaining the she-donkey here Erasmus will expand on its presence in his allegorical interpretation at the end of the account of the entry into Jerusalem. The house door is mentioned in Mark 11:4, but there it is part of the narrator's report of what the disciples found, not part of Jesus' instructions.

41 The Vulgate says in verse 32 that the disciples found 'the colt standing.' Mark 11:4 says that the disciples found the colt tied up (see the preceding note). Erasmus had reported in the annotation *sicut dixerat eis stantem pullum* (on 19:32) that 'the colt standing' was not in his Greek manuscripts but he believed it was inserted into the Latin text to make the language clearer. His NT after 1516 omitted the phrase; see note 457–9 to his annotation on this verse in ASD VI-5 577. Here he amplifies based on Mark.

42 *dominus opus habet illo.* Here and above Erasmus replaces the respective Vulgate versions of 'has need of it' with a simpler and more literal rendering of the Greek αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει in verses 31 and 34. Erasmus had pointed out the Greek wording and offered this simpler translation in the annotations *operam eius desiderat* (on 19:31) and *quia dominus eum necessarium habet* (on 19:34).

so that the unbroken and unshod colt would not bruise his hooves on the stones.[43]

Now when they had reached the foot of the hill and were heading straight for Jerusalem, a strange feeling seized the hearts of everyone, those who had been travelling with Jesus and those who had come out from Jerusalem to meet him.[44] For in their enthusiasm they strewed the road on which the Lord was going with branches broken off from the trees all around, and with great joy and in loud voices they began to praise God for all the good deeds and miracles they had seen and heard done by Jesus. On all sides the voices echoed, congratulating the Lord as if he were a commander in triumph,[45] and shouting out, 'Hosanna in the highest! Blessed is he

* * * * *

43 Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 21 PL 26 153A–B also gives comfort for the rider and safety for the unbroken beast as the reasons for spreading garments on its back and on the road.

44 This sentence from 'everyone' paraphrases a Latin text that corresponds to the Greek ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν 'the whole crowd of disciples.' The Vulgate that Erasmus corrects according to the Greek in *1522* is *omnes turbae discedentium* (on 19:37), that is, 'all the crowds of those going.' (*Discedentium* was corrected to *descendentium* 'those going down' in *1527* and *1535*.) For the variety of alternative readings for *discedentium*, see the apparatus in the Weber Vulgate. The paraphrase accommodates both the Greek, in speaking of those who had travelled with Jesus, and the Vulgate, in speaking of those who had gone out from Jerusalem. This division of the crowd into two groups is based on Matt 21:8 and Mark 11:8, but that one group has come out from Jerusalem to meet Jesus reflects John 12:12–13. In the next sentence the crowd's use of branches from the trees is not part of Luke's account but is found in the other three Gospels, as noted by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 568D–569A and the *Gloss* (on 19:36).

45 'Commander in triumph' is *triumphator*, a word that to the ancient Romans specifically meant a victorious commander-in-chief returning to Rome in the *triumphus* 'triumph,' the official procession and ceremony awarded him by the Roman senate; see the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Triumphs were regularly reported by Roman annalistic historians, especially Livy, among the government's official acts in the course of a year. In the Vulgate related words appear occasionally in a more general sense in OT history and prophecy (eg 1 Sam 15:12 and 29, Ezek 22:5); the same language is found to describe God's triumph in Christ at 2 Cor 2:14 and Col 2:15. Erasmus picks up the imagery in his allegorical interpretation just below. The scene of a victorious general's entry into the city, though not the typical language of the Roman triumph, is invoked by Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 21 PL 26 153C. For Erasmus' own disapproving view of the display of arrogant cruelty in the Roman triumph, see Allen Ep 2090:17–22. Cf Mechtilde O'Mara 'Triumphs, Trophies, and Spoils: Roman History in Some Paraphrases on Paul by Erasmus' in *Holy Scripture*

who comes in the name of the Lord! Peace in heaven and glory in the highest!'[46] This was the cry of the general crowd, especially of the young men,[47] who as if under some divine inspiration and despite the hostility of the Pharisees gave public witness for our Lord Jesus. But there were in the crowd some Pharisees with whom this acclamation did not sit well, parading as it did something greater than a human being. Some of them warned Jesus to exert his authority to restrain the blasphemous acclamations, arising from an immoderate enthusiasm for the teacher and on that account unwelcome even to the Lord himself, who would not acknowledge such extraordinary praise. 'Teacher,' they said, 'rebuke your disciples.' Jesus, however, did not suppress the pious proclamation of simple people, but indirectly criticized the blindness of the Pharisees, who were not afraid to attribute to Beelzebub the prince of demons the great deeds that the Lord had done.[48] He replied, 'What brazenness it would be for me to put a stop to them quite properly singing glory to God and now chanting in pious voices what was once said by the prophets! I assure you, God is so far from wanting this praise of him to be hushed that if the people fell silent the very stones would cry out.' And those who cannot be stirred to proclaim the glory of God though called to it by so many good deeds, so many miracles, are harder than stone.[49]

* * * * *

Speaks: The Production and Reception of Erasmus' Paraphrases on the New Testament ed Hilmar M. Pabel and Mark Vessey (Toronto 2002) 115–21.

46 The wording of this acclamation in Latin and in Greek shows more than the usual amount of variation in the manuscript tradition of the Gospel. Erasmus' paraphrased version begins with the 'hosanna in the highest' that concludes the acclamation in Matt 21:9 and Mark 11:10; a simple 'hosanna' begins the acclamation in John 12:13. His *benedictus qui* 'blessed is he' statement, like Ps 118:26 and the versions of Matt 21:9 and Mark 11:9, omits any reference to the person blessed as being a king, though such reference is found in both Luke 19:38 and John 12:13. The conclusion is unaltered from the version in the text of 19:38. Cf Fitzmyer AB Luke on this passage.

47 Erasmus draws attention to the *iuvenes* 'young men' among the crowd perhaps in anticipation of the mention of the disciples, who are at least 'young men' by virtue of their status as students. More likely he is thinking of Matt 21:15–16, where the temple authorities rebuke Jesus because 'boys' (*pueri*, παῖδες) are singing 'Hosanna to the son of David' in the temple. Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 876C–877B credits 'boys' (παῖδες) with meeting Jesus and singing, and also with spreading palm branches, according to 'another evangelist'; Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1032C has a shorter version of the same observation. Presumably they are thinking of the Matthew passage.

48 The Pharisees claim Beelzebub is the source of Jesus' power at eg 11:14–20.

49 Both the *Gloss* (*mystice* on 19:40) and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:40) 247v say that the gentiles would find their stony hearts softened and would proclaim the

And so, in such a triumphal procession and with such a retinue our Lord Jesus went to Jerusalem. For it pleased him to taste this bit of the world's glory before he submitted himself to the cross; and he wrung this confession from the nation by whom he was soon to be most cruelly put to death, so that the Jews would be condemned out of their own mouth because they had crucified their Messiah and saviour.

Furthermore, there is no little mystery in this narrative of events.[50] A donkey was standing, and a colt the foal of the donkey was also standing. The donkey had already become accustomed to the saddle, was used to bearing the yoke of the Law; that is, was the nation of the Jews. The colt, the foal of the donkey (because salvation took its beginning from the Jews), was the still-unbroken people of the gentiles, neither weighed down by the yoke of the Law nor having Jesus in the saddle through obedience to the gospel. Both beasts were tied, because the synagogue was enslaved to the flesh of the Law, not aspiring to the freedom of the Spirit, and the gentiles were in bondage to the edicts of philosophers and the worship of demons. The two animals at that time had joint masters, and those in no small numbers. Indeed among both the people of the Jews and those of the

* * * * *

Lord's praise if the Jews were to keep silence about it; see Erasmus' comment in the second sentence of the next paragraph.

50 Having concluded a paraphrase on the entry into Jerusalem whose amplifications are almost entirely confined to the narrative or literal meaning, from this point to 'are grateful to this colt' below Erasmus has collected and enlarged from the exegetical tradition a set of tropological and allegorical interpretations of it. The relevant passages are Origen (in Jerome's translation) *Hom in Lucam* 37 PL 26 325C–326C, Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 21 PL 26 152C–153A, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 567C–569A, the *Gloss* (on 19:30–36), and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:30–36) 246v–247r. In these are found 1/ the analogy of she-donkey and colt to Jews and gentiles respectively, the one subject to the yoke of the Law (the language is Jerome's) and the other unbroken to a master; 2/ the explanation of the animals being tied up as symbolic enslavement; 3/ the identification of the 'masters' or 'owners' of verse 30 as sins, and the contrast between the many masters and the one true master; 4/ the identification of the two disciples dispatched to fetch the donkey and her colt as (allegorically) Peter the apostle to the Jews and Paul the apostle to the gentiles; 5/ the analogy between Jesus the rider of the unbroken colt and Christ the rider of the souls of individual Christians, who should display the colt's willing obedience; and 6/ the garments of the apostles and the other followers of Jesus interpreted as apostolic teaching and various sorts of good examples (see also n59 below). Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1885C–1888D and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1029D–1032C have allegorical treatments that tend to diverge, though not markedly, from these.

gentiles many were slaves to greed, lust, self-seeking, envy, and other foul and merciless masters. At the Lord's bidding two apostles loose them, Peter the teacher of the circumcision and Paul the teacher of the gentiles,[51] while pardoning both peoples for all the sins of their former life through faith in the gospel and baptism, so that once loosed they may hereafter be worthy to have Jesus as their rider. For he gave this power to his disciples, that not only among the Jews but also among the gentiles whatever they loosed on earth would also be loosed in heaven.[52]

And why is it surprising if those former masters are not able to hinder the unbinding, when the ones who do the unbinding do it at the bidding of the master whose will no one opposes? He has need of such beasts, he rejoices to sit on the backs of such as obey in simplicity, gladly accept the easy yoke of gospel teaching, do not rear up against their rider but carry him on their backs at a quiet pace and glorify their Lord Jesus until they come[53] into the holy city and the temple of the Lord – not the city that kills its prophets but the heavenly city that knows nothing of rebelliousness.[54] The princes of the world love steeds that are fierce, bred and trained for war. The Lord Jesus loves donkeys that gently carry their gentle master and do not throw their rider from their backs. Haughty princes of this world deride such conveyance, sneering philosophers deride it, swollen-headed Pharisees deride it; and they think themselves happy because they carry on their backs the devil, a most ungentle rider, because they are enslaved to so many and so merciless masters, though true happiness is serving the one Lord. Nothing is happier than these lowly and simple ones once they are unbound from slavery, once they have accepted the Lord Jesus on their backs. In the eyes of the world the uneducated, the simple, the innocent of deceit seem to belong to the class of donkeys, but they have the Lord as their drover, who does not let them go astray, who sees fit not only to sit upon their backs but also to dwell in their hearts, which he guides with his Spirit.

The beasts were bare before, but the apostles clothe them with their garments, their teaching and models of a holy life, preparing the animals

* * * * *

51 For the language of 'circumcision' and 'the gentiles,' cf Gal 2:7–9. The same language is found in the interlinear *Gloss* on 19:29 to explain the two disciples; see the previous note, on Peter and Paul.

52 Cf Matt 16:19 and 18:18. The word translated here as 'loose' is *solvere*, the same word used in the Vulgate of verses 30 and 33, and in Erasmus' paraphrase, for untying the colt. It is also found in the Vulgate of the two Matthew passages.

53 'They come' (*pervenerint*) is the reading in the lifetime editions, though LB has 'he comes.'

54 Cf Matt 11:30 (the easy yoke), Revelation 21 (the holy city and temple, the heavenly city), 13:34 (the city that kills its prophets).

for Jesus to mount, and what he once did in the manner of flesh he never ceases to do in the spiritual sense. The road was rough, but the disciples smooth it too with the garments they spread upon it, showing that the way of godliness is easy if one goes by the examples of the saints and submits himself to our Lord Jesus. The route is through palm branches, through the green leaves of trees, through the memory, ever flourishing and green, of martyrs, virgins, and confessors. For what a great number of examples offers itself on all sides to those who enter on the way of godliness! The very books of the Jews provide a great supply of this type, and for gentiles too. All those who acknowledge Christ as Lord are grateful to this colt.

Even today there is no lack of Pharisees, nor will there ever be, to turn hot with rage at Christ's glory. For they would prefer to hear themselves acclaimed thus, 'Hosanna in the highest! Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord' – though they do not come in the Lord's name but in their own. But while the Jews today keep quiet about Christ's glory, of which they are jealous, the stones, now turned into sons of Abraham, cry out. The inhabitants of Jerusalem cry, 'Away with him, away with him, crucify him!'[55] The Irish, Scots, Britons, Gauls, Sarmatians, Germans cry, 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!' Those who, while they expend their energy for the sake of their own glory, try to darken Christ's glory, those who for their private convenience suppress and debase the straightforwardness of Sacred Scripture while they want their own grandeur proclaimed by humans and Christ's glory hushed up – these, of course, are playing the role of the Pharisees, trying to stop the mouths of the sons of the Hebrews whom God had inspired to sing the glory of his name, and of his Son, whom he gave to the world as its saviour.

There is also salvific meaning in the fact that there is a descent from the mountain, then a journey through the plain, then again an ascent up Mt Zion, for the temple of the Lord had been erected on this latter mountain. Unless the mountain had the oil on which the lamp of faith is fed, there would be no descent from trust in the Law, in which the Jews swell with pride, or from trust in philosophy, in which the gentiles take smug pleasure.[56] For the journey starts from faith. Moreover, it is necessary to approach the house of the mouth, for that is what Bethphage means in Syrian.

* * * * *

55 John 19:15

56 'The mountain' at the beginning of this and the previous sentence must be Mt Olivet. Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 21 PL 26 152B and more elaborately Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 567A, followed by the *Gloss* (on 19:29), also have allegorical explanations of the oil of Mt Olivet (as knowledge, devotion, and spiritual gifts) but none mentions a lamp of faith.

This is not the mouth that swells with scorn but the one that gives birth to confession of sins. And it ought to be not far from Bethany, which means the house of obedience.[57] Now not everyone obeys the gospel.[58] Yet from it is the beginning of salvation. After the descent the journey is through the plain, everywhere strewn with the palm branches of good examples, until the route goes uphill again onto Mt Zion, which means watchtower. This is surely that peak of virtue from which, as from a lofty watchtower, there is a view down to all the things below that this world boasts of as lofty. And now near to heaven the heart contemplates the things that are eternal and that surpass every human sense.[59]

So then, when our Lord Jesus had gotten far enough to have Jerusalem in closer view, looking at that city grand and splendid in its buildings, flourishing in its citizens, its riches, and its reputation for religiosity, proud in its present circumstances and in ignorance careless of its coming downfall, he was moved to pity, and he wept. And in broken words, his voice catching as if for sorrow, he bewailed the destruction of the city, speaking to this effect: 'If you knew, as I know, that this is your day, when peace and the remission of your earlier sins is offered you, you would rush to embrace what is offered.[60] This is surely your day, the day on which you are called to repen-

* * * * *

57 Both definitions, *domus buccae* 'house of the mouth' and *domus obedientiae* 'house of obedience,' are found in Jerome *De nominibus Hebraicis* CCL 72 135, though he gives a very slightly different one for Bethphage (*domus maxillarum* 'house of the jaws') in *Comm in Matthaeum* 21 PL 26 152B, where he adds that the town name was a metaphor for 'confession.' Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 566D–567A picks up Jerome's definitions and elaborates on confession (which he takes as confession of sin, not of faith) and obedience; he is followed by the *Gloss* (on 19:29) and Hugh of St Cher (on 19:29) 246r. Erasmus had not even named the towns in the paraphrase on verse 29; cf n39 above.

58 Cf Rom 10:16.

59 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 569A, followed by the *Gloss* (on 19:36) suggests that what the crowd spread before Jesus (garments in this Gospel, but Erasmus added to his paraphrase the tree branches of the other Gospels, n44 above) symbolizes the practice of self-denial in imitation of the examples of the martyrs. For the meaning 'watchtower' for Zion, cf n37 above; in the passage cited there, besides calling Jerusalem the citadel of the watchtower, Jerome had said it is the city of peace and the site of the vision of God. The next to last sentence of this paragraph is a thematic echo of Satan's temptation of Jesus; cf 4:5–8 and the paraphrase on those verses.

60 Here, as earlier in the paraphrase on 15:22, Erasmus dramatizes the physical attributes of weeping. One reason for the 'broken words' (*verbis abruptis*), however, may lie in the syntactic harshness of verse 42: its first part, 'if you knew, etc' is a conditional clause for which a conclusion is not given but is left to be supplied by the reader. In the annotation *nunc autem quae ad pacem* (on

tance and the goodness of God invites you to penitence; but the invitation is at the last stage of generosity, and to it nothing can be added. The mercy of God, so often spurned by you, sees fit to visit you in a new way, so that at least in this fashion you may soften. Another day will come, not yours, but the day of the Romans and of the vengeance of God, when you will pay the penalty for all your misdeeds, which you preferred to heap up rather than bewail. But now you neither recognize your own day nor look ahead to that other day not yours, since both have been hidden from your eyes, eyes blind with the intoxication of your present happiness. You neither recall the past evils that you committed, nor look ahead to the coming things that loom over you, nor recognize God's present goodness towards you.

'Since you stubbornly spurn his goodness, incurable city, murderer of those who bring you news of salvation,[61] foreigners will come against you and bring destruction upon you. You will turn from your Messiah and adopt Caesar as your king.[62] Hence you will find your kings coming to you with a far different equipage than your king now comes, gentle and bringing salvation. You do not welcome the one who comes to give you salvation, and you will be compelled to welcome those who come to give you ruin. For Roman princes will come, enemies in place of kings, whom you had elevated above your own king, with their armed forces.[63]

* * * * *

19:42) Erasmus pointed out that Jerome's understanding of the suppressed conclusion, found in his commentaries on Isaiah (cf PL 24 579B–C, 588B) and on Micah (cf PL 25 1170D–1171A), is that the day of Jesus' triumphal entry is Jerusalem's last day to accept the good she has been offered, believe in Jesus, and follow him. Both the Greek text and Theophylact (*Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1033B), Erasmus says, are consonant with this reading. He contrasts this with the interpretation of 'more recent theologians,' who propose 'you too would weep at the coming evils' as the conclusion, but that, he says, is incongruent with what follows. The 'more recent theologians' he has in mind are apparently Gregory the Great *Hom in Evang* 39 PL 76 1294C–D, followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 570D, the *Gloss* (on 19:42), Hugh of St Cher (on 19:42) 247v–248r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 19:42). The paraphrase on Jesus' words in the rest of this paragraph emphasizes the interpretation Erasmus preferred in the annotation; even so, his preceding description of Jerusalem as 'in ignorance careless of its coming downfall' accommodates the 'more recent' interpretation.

61 Another allusion to 13:34; cf the paraphrase on verse 40 and n54 above.

62 Cf the paraphrase on verse 26 and n34 above.

63 The exegetical tradition overwhelmingly understood the reference in verses 43–4 to be to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 AD, vividly described by Josephus (who was present) in the *Jewish War* 5–7. Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 39 PL 76 1294A says that every reader of that history understands the event of which the Lord speaks. Attack on

First they will fence you in with an earthwork so that there is no escape route. Then they will encircle you on all sides with men and siege engines and will crush you with a tight blockade. In the end they will level your mass of buildings, temple and all, to the ground.[64] And not content with this, they will cut down and massacre the sons of whom you boast and whose arrogance you in your turn increase by your splendour; and they will so eradicate all that glory of yours that they will not leave one stone cemented to another, lest there be any trace of you remaining, lest there be any hope of your restoration. Such things will indeed be pitiable, but they will happen only as you deserve, because though called so many times, long ago by various prophets and now also by John and your Messiah, you stubbornly spurn the mercy of God. Hence you will know the time of vengeance, because you refused to acknowledge the time of visitation.[65] You yourself could have embraced the salvation offered. Now at any rate in your destruction you will offer others a salutary example, so that they may not similarly spurn the goodness of God when it calls them to better things.'

After he said this Jesus came to Jerusalem and entered the temple and threw out of it the people buying and selling, saying, 'God says in

* * * * *

and destruction of cities in ancient warfare, and historians' methods of reporting them, followed well-established patterns, but it is worth noting that Josephus' long account lays particular emphasis on Titus' earthworks and siege operations, the futile attempts of the defenders to flee, and the utter razing of the city. Erasmus highlights the same events. Many of Erasmus' predecessors found a tropological meaning in the historical destruction and its prophecy here, eg Origen *Hom in Lucam* 38 PL 26 327B–C, Augustine *Quaestiones evangeliorum* 2.48, Gregory the Great *Hom in Evang* 39 PL 76 1295B–C, the *Gloss* (on 19:41), Nicholas of Lyra (*moraliter* on 19:44). Erasmus has only one such sentence, at the end of this paragraph.

64 'Level ... to the ground' is *solo aequabunt*. In the annotation *ad terram prosternent* (on 19:44) Erasmus had explained that the Greek word ἐδαφιοῦσιν comes from a Greek word for 'ground' or 'pavement,' so that it means something more than the Latin translator's expression (which might mean just 'push to the ground'); he had suggested the more precise *solo aequare*.

65 *tempus visitationis*. Erasmus keeps the expression in the Latin text of verse 44, though he had noted in the annotation *tempus visitationis* (on 19:44) that a better word than *visitatio* for the Greek ἐπισκοπή would be *inspectio*, and had suggested that the translator had a slightly different Greek word in his text. The retention of *tempus visitationis* might have been influenced by the opportunity to use the alliterative *tempus vindictae* 'the time of vengeance' just before it.

Scripture: This my house is dedicated not to trade but to prayer; yet you have turned it into a den of thieves, stripping the visitors here bare and with your godless schemes taking care of your own profit at others' expense.' In this action the Lord Jesus made clear what great damage is done to the church by those who on the pretext of godliness put their effort into base gain, who in the name of religion carry on their own business, not feeding the flock but skinning it,[66] and in their dishonest teaching killing the souls that they ought to have brought to life by honest teaching.

After this the Lord taught daily in the temple as if busy about his own kingdom, in open disregard of the incurable malice of the Pharisees. Angered by these events, those who held the first rank among the priests, the scribes, and the leaders of the people were grasping for an opportunity to do away with their saviour. There was no lack of evil intention, but they had not a glimmer of hope of accomplishing what they wanted. They had heard the cheers of the people, they also saw the whole crowd in the temple hanging on his words,[67] so great was the force and the grace of the divine word. Once it had tasted the new wine of the gospel's power, the crowd sneered at the priests' frigid teaching as stale wine, teaching about ritual washing, about corban, about tithing mint and rue.[68] Hence they feared for their authority, they feared for their income, they feared for their kingdom.

Indeed, what happened at that time in history often occurs tropologically whenever those who uphold the citadel of religion and who are

* * * * *

66 *non pascentes gregem sed deglubentes*, paraphrasing Jesus' injunctions to Peter to 'feed my sheep'; cf John 21:15–17 and the paraphrase on those verses CWE 46 224 and n25, where he used the same verb *deglubere*, said to have been used by the emperor Tiberius in a rebuke to one of his tax collectors: *boni pastoris esse tondere pecus, non deglubere* 'It is the mark of a good shepherd to shear the sheep, not skin them' (Suetonius *Tiberius* 32.2).

67 'Hanging on his words' is *suspensam pendere ab ore illius*. Erasmus had observed in the annotation *suspensus erat audiens illum* (on 19:48) that the Greek verb ἐξεκρέματο 'hung on' would be better translated by *pendere* 'hang' or *inhiare* 'pay eager attention to,' and had illustrated his point with a quotation from Virgil *Aeneid* 4.79, describing Dido's ardent attention to Aeneas in the early stages of her passion for him: *pendetque iterum narrantis ab ore* 'She hangs on his words as he tells the story again.' Here he incorporates his suggestion, along with an echo, *suspensam*, of the text familiar to his readers.

68 Erasmus often uses the figure of new wine preferred over old or stale wine, eg in the paraphrases on Luke 5:39 and 16:15–16; these are discussed in Jane E. Phillips 'Food and Drink in Erasmus' Gospel Paraphrases' ERSY 14 (1994) 37–41. For ritual washing see 11:38, for washing and corban, Matt 15:4–6, Mark 7:1–13, and the paraphrase on 19:8 above; for tithing mint and rue, 11:42.

conspicuous in their assertion of sacred learning conspire with profane princes against Jesus; then a great destruction threatens the people. That happens when the authority of priests and professors of sacred learning fawns upon the monarchs of this world and in their authority they slavishly minister to the monarchs' whims though they ought to have checked the monarchs' power with salutary and outspoken admonishment; and in turn the monarchs with their resources bolster and buttress the depraved lusts of bishops and theologians, that is, greed, ambition, tyranny. Though neither group has any fondness for the other, yet they exchange services in unholy collusion, to the ruin of gospel truth. The criminal confederation of these men brings greater destruction to the world than that long-ago conspiracy of priests, scribes, Pharisees and leaders.

Chapter 20

Therefore, unholy though their desire to kill him was, they sought an opportunity to appear in human eyes to be acting out of zeal for righteousness. So it came about that one day[1] when Jesus was teaching the people in the temple and impressing on them the happy and longed-for news of eternal salvation, the conspiring chief priests along with the scribes and Pharisees and leaders of the people met[2] there to put a stop to Jesus' sacred teaching, on the grounds of authority if nothing else. They could not condemn his marvellous deeds, so many of which the people had witnessed him performing. They could not refute his teaching, which was in complete accord with the Law and with the divine will. So they planned a false charge claiming that he had appropriated authority to teach the people when he should have received it from them. Plainly they were doing this either to transfer to themselves the glory owed to God or to fabricate[3] against

* * * * *

1 *die quodam.* The annotation *in uno dierum* (on 20:1) had observed that while the Greek and Latin texts say 'on one of (those) days,' the idiomatic use of the numeral 'one' for the indefinite article is a Hebraism, and better Latin requires *quodam die* 'on a day,' 'one day.'

2 The paraphrase follows the Vulgate text in saying that Jesus' enemies *convenerunt* 'met.' The annotation *convenerunt* (on 20:1) had noted that the Greek word ἐπέστησαν actually means 'threatened,' 'rose up against' and had proposed three other Latin verbs as better translations. Here Erasmus adopts none of his earlier suggestions but adds 'conspiring' and the purpose of the conspiracy to convey the meaning of the Greek verb.

3 'Fabricate' is *struerent*, the reading of all the lifetime editions, though LB reads *statuerent* 'establish, set up.'

Christ the false charge of stirring up sedition because he was convening the people and occupying their attention without the public authorization of their leaders.

So all together they went up to Jesus in the temple and said, 'If you want us too to believe in you, tell us on what authority you do what you do. You baptize,[4] you preach, you heal on the Sabbath, you teach in the temple, you gather disciples, you distract the people and occupy their attention. You are unknown to us, you are vested with no public powers. Who then gave you this authority?'

Now Jesus understood that this interrogation came from godless scheming, that is, so that they could make their false charge, not so that they could learn. He did not attempt to instruct them but blunted their malice as if driving out one nail with another.[5] For they had rated John the Baptist highly and had streamed to his baptism.[6] John too had gathered disciples and had preached to the crowds in the wilderness and around the Jordan that the kingdom of God was at hand; he outspokenly condemned the faults of anyone and everyone, and invited them to penitence. Nor had any authority been given to him from the priests, Pharisees, and leaders of the people; he had come from the desert like a new man on the scene,[7] inspired and sent by God, according to the prophecy of Isaiah. Indeed, the loaded question of the leading men had this aim: if Christ answered that the authority had been given him by God, they would accuse him of blasphemy because, human as he was, he claimed for himself a right of close converse or commerce with God. He had not gotten it from the priests, Pharisees, and scribes. There was besides, to their way of thinking, the fact that the

* * * * *

4 One of the false charges, since only the disciples baptized; cf John 4:1–2.

5 'Driving out one nail with another' is *Adagia* I ii 4: *clavum clavo pellere.* Cf the paraphrase on 12:5 above and n4 there. Hugh of St Cher (on 20:3) 248v also draws the contrast between the priests' apparent wish to learn and real intention to entrap, and attributes to Jesus' knowledge of their intention a reply calculated to silence them.

6 See Matt 3:7. Hugh of St Cher (on 20:3) 249r says that the Pharisees knew John was a prophet but still refused to believe in him.

7 'New man on the scene' translates *novus homo.* The Latin phrase, which literally means 'new man,' is a piece of ancient Roman political jargon familiar to readers of Roman republican writers, especially Cicero. It described an individual who reached the highest ranks of Roman political life without benefit of an inherited family tradition of service in those ranks to smooth his way – such as Cicero himself. See the *Oxford Classical Dictionary.* Luke 3:2–18 sketches the career of John the Baptist and quotes Isa 40:3–5.

power he appropriated was seditious and derived from Satan's influence.[8] For they argued that all divine power had devolved on themselves and that nothing was done piously that was not done on their authority. And now, blind with hate, they did not consider that they had looked up to John, who did like things on no human authority, so much that they maintained that he was the Messiah – except that John did no miracles.[9] Yet for this reason they should have raised less fuss about Christ. And it did not even occur to them that God had long ago handed over this power when he spoke through his prophets. They accepted the authority of the prophets, and they rejected the reality the prophets had foretold. So, wanting to mock their wicked wisdom and stupid cunning, the Lord replied in this way: 'Before I reply to your question, I shall want to know something from you myself, which you can explain in a word. When you have explained it, I will reply to your inquiry. Tell me, John's baptism: was it from heaven or from human beings? And on whose authority did he baptize, authority he got from heaven or from you?'

Then and there the godless conscience of the Jews perceived the horns of a dilemma.[10] If they had wanted to answer truthfully, the declaration of the truth was straightforward and ready to hand; but they perceived that they were being challenged with the same craft they were using. So they undertook a plan of deceit. Indeed, nothing is more laborious than putting on false appearances, and one lie involves another, one trick the next.[11] So they had a consultation: 'What shall we answer to this problem? If we say that the authority of John came from heaven, he will promptly turn it back on our own heads and say, "Then why didn't you have faith in him when he gave witness about me? He admitted he was the lesser, and

* * * * *

8 In his comment on verse 2 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 574B says that the priests deliberately imply that Jesus' power is from the devil; the remark is echoed by the *Gloss* (on 20:2).

9 John 1:19–20; cf Luke 3:15.

10 Erasmus literally says *cornuta interrogatio* 'a horned question,' an expression first known from Jerome *Adversus Helvidium de Mariae virginitate perpetua* PL 23 210B–C. Jerome implies in Ep 69.2 PL 22 655 that 'horned' in this use is a neologism or slang term in his day: 'a horned syllogism, as the expression is, so that whichever way I turn I am held more tightly.' According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (1933) under 'horn' 26, Nicholas Udall introduced 'horned' in this sense into English in a note on his translation 'horned question' of *cornuta interrogatio* in this passage in the 1548 English *Paraphrases*.

11 There is no similarity in language, but for the thought cf *Adagia* II iii 74: *Mendacem memorem esse oportet* 'A liar should have a good memory.'

unworthy to carry my sandals.[12] He declared that he was earthly, speaking earthly things, and humble, speaking humble things, but that I, having come from heaven, was greater than all things.[13] How is it that you accept his authority as having come from God and openly lay false charges against my authority, about which he gave witness?" But if we say that John did nothing on God's authority but only by a human spirit, the whole populace will rise up against us with stones, because they are all convinced[14] that John was a prophet and did what he did by divine inspiration.'

They had no interest in giving a truthful answer, only in giving one convenient to themselves. In the same way false teachers answer not what Scripture teaches but what by their interpretation suits their inclinations. If they answered truthfully, their authority with the people would be at risk; if they answered with a lie, they feared for their lives. Those who had cast off the fear of God were afraid of human beings. And so they said they didn't know. This was the one crack left for them to slip through,[15] but in slipping through it they simultaneously released the Lord from their question. For he said, 'Since you are turning tail, refusing to give the answer that you know, neither will I say to you on what authority I do the things you see – though you know the answer to your own question perfectly well!'

And then, when he had refuted the priests, Pharisees, scribes, and leaders of the people in this way, the Lord added a parable to put before their eyes the incurable wickedness, deserving of destruction, of those who, though in so many ways summoned by God to repentance, always went to the worse, scorning the Law, thrashing and killing the prophets, and who, after the prophets, were even going to kill the ultimate cure of their ills, the Son of God, and afflict him again repeatedly in the apostles and martyrs. The parable goes like this:

'A certain man,' he said, 'planted a vineyard that he held singularly dear, leaving nothing undone to make a profit from it someday. For he

* * * * *

12 See Matt 3:11, who also says 'carry,'; the other evangelists, including Luke, speak of unloosing the shoestrings.

13 See John 3:31.

14 'Are all convinced' is *cuncti persuasum habent*. The annotation *certi enim sunt* (on 20:6) points out that the Latin, which means 'they are certain,' is not a correct translation of the Greek πεπεισμένος γάρ ἐστιν 'they are persuaded' because *certus* connotes certainty about a truth, whereas one can be persuaded or convinced of a falsehood. Here Erasmus adopts the suggestion he had offered there, *persuasum habere* 'to be convinced.' Cf CWE 56 381 and 401.

15 *una rima ... qua elaberentur*. Cf *Adagia* III ii 75: *Reperire rimam* 'To find a chink' CWE 34 253.

carefully put a fence around it, built a tower in it to guard it, dug out a pit, added a winepress.[16] Once it was well equipped with everything, he leased it to tenants to cultivate it and harvest the fruit. Thereupon he went abroad and stayed away for a long time.[17]

'Now to be sure, this is the vineyard of the Lord Sabaoth,[18] which the Lord brought out of Egypt, planted in the land of promise, fenced within the enclosure of the Law, guarded with his watchfulness, adorned with the temple, and to it added priests, judges, generals, teachers: he omitted nothing that pertained to its care. And this well-cared-for vineyard, by fault of the tenants, after it had long been expected to yield wine grapes, finally yielded wild grapes. Meanwhile the Lord, though he is nowhere not present, seemed to the tenants to be far away, because he spent his time in heaven.[19]

'So when it was time for the people of Israel to be delivering fruit worthy of such loving kindness on God's part, the planter of the vineyard sent his servant, a prophet, to the tenants, that is, to the leaders, priests, and

* * * * *

16 Matt 21:33 has fence, winepress, and tower; Mark 12:1 has fence, pit, and tower.

17 'For a long time' is *diu*. Erasmus uses a common Latin adverb instead of the too-literal and unclear Vulgate expression he had criticized in the annotation *multis temporibus* (on 20:9).

18 The Hebrew title for the Lord 'of hosts' (*exercituum*) is found at Rom 9:29 and James 5:4. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1890D uses it in his discussion of this parable, where, citing Isaiah, he identifies the owner and his vineyard as the Lord of hosts and the house of Israel. Ambrose's comment is echoed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 575B and the *Gloss* (*moraliter* on 20:9). Isa 5:1–7 and also Ps 80:8–16 seem to be influencing much of Erasmus' language here, though neither (in the Vulgate) has 'Sabaoth' but *exercituum*; both passages are cited by Hugh of St Cher (on 20:9) 249v. See Erasmus' discussion of 'Sabaoth' in the annotation *verbum enim consummans* (on Rom 9:28) CWE 56 272 and the notes there.

19 The presence of God everywhere is pointed out by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 575B, citing Jer 23:24; the comment is eched by the *Gloss* (on 20:9). Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 885B says that since God had not appeared to the Jews in visible form after his visitation on Mt Sinai, he appeared to be 'away' in human terms.

In this parable Erasmus integrates narrative and exposition so completely that the paraphrast's voice cannot be separated from that of Jesus as he tells the story. The English translator is thus presented with a familiar problem in rendering the word *dominus*, uniformly lowercased in Erasmus' published texts. Is it to be 'lord,' owner of the vineyard, or 'Lord,' the deity symbolized by the vineyard owner? Because Erasmus has not made his usual distinction between narrative and exposition, the word 'Lord' is capitalized in every occurrence through the parable proper, but not in the question Jesus puts at the end. See the references in the Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited under *dominus*.

scribes who had the reins of government in their hands, so that they would hand over the ripe fruit. The tenants, who had been cultivating the vineyard for their own benefit, not the Lord's, beat up the servant, drove him off covered with blows and sent him back empty-handed. For against which of the prophets was violence not committed?[20] But the Lord's mildness was so great that he did not commit violence against the tenants even when provoked by such a great affront. Instead he sent a second servant to try whether he might be able to recall them to their duty. But they treated him no more gently than they had the first. For having covered him with blows and heaped him with insults, they sent him back – without the anticipated fruit but loaded down with unjust treatment. For where would they go except to the Lord, who has said, "Vengeance is mine, and I will repay"?[21] Not even thus goaded did the Lord's mildness spring to revenge; he sent a third servant. This one too the tenants afflicted with actual wounds and sent back empty-handed to the Lord. Indeed, the Lord's goodness, which invited them to penitence, goaded their wickedness the more.

'Now every insult with which they had afflicted the servants he had sent properly applied to the Lord who had sent them, and now by rights they ought to have been punished, since they had so often been summoned but had always gone on to greater wrongdoings. Nonetheless, out of his signal mildness he put off his vengeance for a while yet, preferring to try the ultimate cure rather than commit violence against the tenants. He thought to himself, "What shall I do to bring my impious tenants back to a better frame of mind, when it is their fault that the fruit of my vineyard has been going to waste this long time? I sent so many servants; it did no good. I will do the one thing that is left. I will send my only and well-beloved son. Though they scorned my servants, perhaps when they see him, even if they have no love for him, they will surely respect him, honouring me in him. Those who are evil by nature sometimes can be restrained by shame, at least, from evildoing." This is the plan that suited the most merciful Lord, to pursue the salvation of the tenants by risking his own son, so eager was he for saving and so slow to vengeance.[22] The son went in obedience to the

* * * * *

20 Cf Acts 7:52.

21 Deut 32:35, repeated in Rom 12:19 and elsewhere. See the annotation *mihi vindictam* (on Rom 12:19) CWE 56 342. Here Erasmus replaces the Vulgate *retribuam* 'I will repay' with *rependam* 'I will repay.'

22 Hugh of St Cher (on 20:13) 250r also attributes the repeated sending of agents, culminating in the son, explicitly to a desire to avoid vengeance and allow the possibility of pardon.

father. When the tenants caught sight of him they not only did not respect him but with godless hearts turned to schemes of utter madness, saying to each other, "Up till now we have thrown out servants. This one is the son and heir, bound to avenge the insult to his father someday. Let us kill him, and claim the inheritance of this vineyard for ourselves, and boldly spurn our Lord." The impious plan was agreed on by the conspirators, and they threw the son out of the vineyard and killed him.'

In these words our Lord Jesus revealed to the priests, scribes, and leaders their own guilty conscience, for they were then planning what they accomplished a little while later, taking Jesus out and crucifying him outside the city.[23] Then he turned to them and asked, 'Since this is the state of affairs, what will the lord of the vineyard do with such tenants?' When they were again too cowardly to answer, the Lord added, 'The lord himself will come and inflict a terrible ruin on those tenants, who could be won over by no gentleness; and when they have been destroyed as they deserve, he will lease his vineyard to others.' In this saying the Lord indicated that when the religion of the Jews had been completely eradicated the fruit of the gospel would be transferred to the gentiles by the apostles. Swearing their righteous aversion, the Pharisees replied, 'God forbid!' For they understood that this whole parable was said against them, and though they did not swear aversion to so godless a purpose, they did still denounce its just avenging.

Jesus wanted to show them that even the thing they claimed would not happen had been predicted by the prophets. So he looked at them and, as if rebuking their bad conscience, said, 'If you put no trust in my parable, then what is it you read in the Psalms, "That stone which the builders discarded is made the head of the corner"? Whoever falls over it will be shattered; and on the other hand it will crush whomever it falls on.' Christ meant that he was the heavenly stone from God whom the Jews rejected, building the synagogue without Christ; but God has made him the cornerstone that links and holds fast both walls and that by means of the gospel faith, without the ceremonies of the Law, joins two peoples into one church.[24] And this stone

* * * * *

23 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 576D–577A says that the heir of the parable is thrown out of the vineyard and killed to symbolize Jesus' crucifixion outside the city. The same explanation is mentioned only to be discarded by Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1040A–B.

24 Christ is the cornerstone of the church, which is built of Jews and gentiles; Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 888A–B, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 577C and the *Gloss* (on 20:17), and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1040D all have the same or a

is the surest defence against all assaults of the world and Satan for those who lean and depend on it in faith. It is besides solid, and undefeated by those who rebel against it. There is no power of this world so great that it is not shattered if it stumbles against this stone; and the stumbler is the one who resists and rejects. Likewise one on whom it falls will even be crushed. And fall it does on those whom, though they have been long endured, the vengeance of God finally overwhelms when they are not expecting it. One and the same stone is salvation for those that rely on it and destruction for those that oppose it.

These parables of the Lord's so exasperated the tempers of the leading priests and scribes that they wanted to lay hands on him then and there. But fear of the people restrained them from their unholy deed, for they saw that as far as the people were concerned, Jesus still rated very highly. For being men fully aware of their own evil purposes, they had realized that the parable just told applied to them; and it had been told specifically so that by understanding it they might be recalled from their wicked plan. But in fact they became more provoked to doing evil by the very thing that should have deterred them from evil. So then, shut off by fear of the people from open accomplishment of the crime they had already accomplished in their hearts, after they had come to a decision they went about carrying out their purpose by subterfuge, all the more criminal in that they added deception to their evil. Just so one who kills by poison is more criminal than one who kills by the sword.[25] Pay attention now, Theophilus,[26] to

* * * * *

similar explanation. Erasmus uses the same interpretation in the paraphrases on 1 Pet 2:6 CWE 44 89–90 and on Eph 2:14–22 LB VII 977E–978E.

25 'Subterfuge' is *cuniculos* 'undermining,' 'tunneling' under city walls as part of siege operations. The idea that a poisoner is more wicked than one who kills by the sword, ie in normal operations of war, may be drawn in part from Cicero *De officiis* 3.86–7, where Cicero tells the story of the Roman general Fabricius, who rejected the offer of a deserter to poison the Romans' opponent King Pyrrhus because he refused to win glory for Rome by such underhanded means. Erasmus had edited the *De officiis* for publication in 1501. The same story about Fabricius and Pyrrhus, with the moral even more explicitly drawn, is in Seneca *Epistulae morales* 120.6, who calls Fabricius 'virtuous in war, to believe that something was a sin even against an enemy.' Erasmus had published an edition of Seneca's works in 1515.

26 Theophilus, the addressee of this Gospel and of Acts, is apostrophized several times by Erasmus' Luke-voice in the course of the *Paraphrase*; cf Jane E. Phillips '*Sub evangelistae persona*: The Speaking Voice in Erasmus' *Paraphrase on Luke*' in *Holy Scripture Speaks: The Production and Reception of Erasmus' Paraphrases on the New Testament* ed Hilmar Pabel and Mark Vessey (Toronto 2002) 136.

the tricks and crafts of the unholy priests who wanted Jesus dead, that is, wanted the gospel truth crushed, for just this reason, that through it the cultivation of the vineyard, whose ownership they had promised to themselves in perpetuity and by inherited right, was being taken from them. They disguised their anger and watched for any opportunity to kill him. In fact, they sent to him certain men who pretended to be righteous (and nothing is more thoroughly criminal than pretended righteousness) to ferret out something from his words that could be reported to the imperial officers and Pilate the governor, who then held power in Judea in Caesar's name, so that the onus of the deed might be transferred to these latter, on whose sentence he would have been killed, and they themselves might appear to have refrained from bloodshed like innocent men.[27] But the more in their human cunning they tried to disguise their motives, the more they betrayed their manifest evil.

So those masked henchmen of the priests made their attack on Jesus in these words: 'Teacher, your uprightness is evident to us: you are outspoken and teach everything correctly; and there is no distinction of persons[28] with you that would make you willing to lie to earn favour with anyone no matter how powerful. You always have God alone before your eyes, you straightforwardly and outspokenly teach what finds favour with him. Tell us, then, what you think on a matter that is a subject of debate with many of us. Is it proper for us to pay taxes to Caesar or not?'

Now Jesus understood their deceptive flattery and where their loaded question was tending (and this is where: if he answered, as they hoped he would, that it was not proper for a people sacred to God to serve and pay their assessment to a godless, idol-worshipping emperor – an opinion that the Pharisees approved, though they dared not state it openly – then they would again suborn people to report him to Caesar's governor Pilate on grounds of treason).[29] In the wisdom of the gospel he so eluded their

* * * * *

27 The *Gloss* (on 20:20) also notes here that the plan of the scribes and Pharisees is designed to protect them from the appearance of blood-guilt.

28 *respectus personarum*, a version of the wording that uses the same verbal stem *respicere/respectus* as the parallel passage at Matt 22:16 (*non enim respicis personam hominum* 'for thou regardest not the person of men') rather than the wording in Luke *non accipis personam* 'neither acceptest thou the person of any' (AV). The use of words related to *accipere* rather than *respicere* in this expression is standard in other parts of the Vulgate NT; cf eg Rom 2:11, Eph 6:9, Col 3:25, James 2:1 and 9, 1 Pet 1:17.

29 Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 22 PL 26 168A–169A says that the Pharisees, believing that the Jews, who paid tithes and first-fruits to God, should not be

deception that he even took away from them the handle for doing harm that they had grasped at[30] and advised them what they themselves ought to do, which without a doubt no one would omit without certain danger to his own salvation. For Christ did not come for the purpose of giving instructions about how much should be paid to Caesar or Caesar's governors, but about what was owed in the spiritual assessment to God, who is Lord over all. 'Why are you testing me?' he said. 'Show me a denarius.' For one who has nothing on earth does not recognize an image of Caesar. When they showed him a coin he asked what the image was, and whose inscription was written there. One who is truly Christian also does not know those things.[31]

Those who did know, that is, who were given over to the world, said, 'Caesar's.' Jesus replied, 'Then render to Caesar whatever belongs to Caesar's realm. For it is no concern of mine what the princes of this world require. It is more to the point that you render to God what you owe him. Recognize his image stamped on your hearts, recognize his label and inscription. Your whole heart is owed to him, and it ought not serve any other than the one who created both body and soul. Why then, bearing the image of God, is it given to the devil?'[32]

* * * * *

subject to human laws, wanted Jesus to fall into their trap by agreeing with that opinion so he could be charged with sedition. The view is repeated in the commentaries on this verse by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 579A, the *Gloss* (on 20:22), and Hugh of St Cher (on 20:22) 250v. For the eventual charge of sedition, see 23:1–5; Matt 26:59–61 and Mark 14:55–9 say that false witnesses were involved.

30 'Handle ... that they had grasped' is *ansam captatam*. Cf *Adagia* I iv 4: *Ansam quaerere* 'To look for a handle' CWE 31 321. There Erasmus explains that the handle is an opportunity. The adage comes up regularly in the Gospel *Paraphrases*; see the indexes to CWE 46 and 49.

31 In the paraphrases on the parallel accounts in Matthew (on 22:20) LB VII 117B and Mark (on 12:16) CWE 49 145 Erasmus explicitly denies that Jesus does not really know whose picture and inscription are on the coin. Thus he follows the position of traditional Latin exegesis of this incident; cf Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 22 PL 26 169B–C, quoted by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 579B and Hugh of St Cher (on 20:24) 251r. Though he makes no similar direct statement here, his remarks about 'one who has nothing' and 'one who is truly Christian' should probably be taken as prescriptive for the reader, not as parts of the narrative.

32 The comparison and contrast between the image of Caesar on a coin and the image of God in a human being (the latter going back to Gen 1:26–7 and 9:6) is found in Origen (in Jerome's translation) *Hom in Lucam* 39 PL 26 330A–B, Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1894A–B, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 579C–D, the *Gloss* (on 20:25), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1044A–C (who speaks of

The crafty deceivers were amazed at so judicious an answer. For even gospel simplicity has its own kind of good sense; yet they did not recognize the divine wisdom in him, but were aggrieved that there was nothing that they could criticize in his words.

When these were gone the Sadducees approached, who advertised themselves on a false claim of righteousness; likewise the Pharisees were so called from the height by which they thought themselves to excel others. (The sect of the Sadducees has this distinguishing feature, that they believe that there is no resurrection of the body, and that nothing of the person remains after death, and that there are no angels.)[33] These put to the Lord this question: 'Teacher, Moses handed down to us this law, that if anyone marries a wife and dies without children, the brother of the dead man should marry the widow, and succeeding to his brother's place, raise up heirs for his brother from the same woman. So it happened that there were seven brothers, the first of whom took a wife and died without children.[34] The next oldest took the wife he left behind, and he also died without fathering children by her. The third oldest brother succeeded him in the marriage, and he also died without children. And to make a long story short, the woman was married in like fashion by every one down to the seventh, and made none of them a father. Finally the woman died too. So then, in the resurrection which one of the seven brothers will claim her as his wife? For the woman married all of them, but she cannot be shared among them all.'

The Sadducees supposed that from this absurdity they could refute the view of the Pharisees, who argued that souls survive bodies and that even

* * * * *

giving the soul in the image of God to the devil), and Hugh of St Cher (on 20:25) 251r.

33 Jerome had explained that the name 'Sadducees' means 'righteous' or 'justified,' and the name 'Pharisees' means 'separated' by reason of their traditions and observances; see *Comm in Matthaeum* 22 PL 26 170A and *De nominibus Hebraicis* CCL 72 136, 142, 146, 155. He is followed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 579D–580A, the *Gloss* (on 20:27), and Hugh of St Cher (on 20:27) 251r. Erasmus uses 'Pharisee' for its meaning when paraphrasing 'set apart' in Rom 1:1, and comments on it in the annotation *segregatus in evangelium dei* (on Rom 1:1); see CWE 42 15 and CWE 56 7–8. The beliefs of the Sadducees and Pharisees about the afterlife are reported by Luke at Acts 23:8.

34 Erasmus' Vulgate of verse 28 used the Latin word *liberi* 'children' and then changed to the word *filii* 'sons' in verses 29 and 30. In the annotation *et mortuus est sine filiis* (on 20:29) Erasmus had said that the Greek ἄτεκνος 'childless,' which is used in all three places, should be translated by either *orbus* 'childless' or *absque liberis* 'without children' because *liberi* means daughters as well as sons. In the paraphrase on verses 28–31 he uses *liberi* exclusively, not *filii*.

the bodies of the dead will someday live again. But since their question was more ignorant than malicious,[35] Jesus did not scorn to instruct them, saying, 'You are wrong, because you imagine that the situation in the life to come is like what you see in this life. The sons of this age, in which there is an alternation of the dying and the newborn, necessarily seek out wives for their sons and betroth their daughters to husbands, and indeed the human race cannot be continued by any other means. So then, marriage is for them not a matter of happiness but of necessity. But those who gain the happiness of being considered worthy of the resurrection of the righteous and of the age which knows no mortality will neither bring in wives for their sons nor give their daughters in marriage to husbands.[36] For what need will there be for marriage and sexual intercourse after no one dies any more? For then they will cease to be flesh and dependent on the inconveniences of this body, but once having obtained an immortal body will live no different from the angels, among whom there is no marriage precisely because with them there is no inevitable dying. Here those who are born mortal from mortals provide for posterity by the practice of marriage. But those, already reborn by power of the Spirit and made children of the living God forever, will not need marriage because they will not know death, because they will have been restored to life immortal by resurrection.'

But since the problem had been set by the Sadducees to mock at the resurrection of the dead because they did not believe that souls survived the body after death, the Lord saw fit to instruct their ignorant minds on this point too, and to do it by authority of Scripture, with which they were certainly not finding fault but which they were not reading carefully enough.

* * * * *

35 Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 70 PG 58 657–8 (on Matt 22:23–8) also focuses on the Sadducees' ignorance rather than on their malice. Erasmus' Jesus begins his reply *erratis imaginantes* 'you are wrong, because you imagine,' echoing Jesus' opening words in Matt 22:29, *erratis nescientes* 'you are wrong, because you do not know.'

36 'Neither bring in wives for their sons nor give their daughters in marriage to husbands' is *nec uxores accersent filiis suis, nec filias suas nuptum dabunt viris.* The paraphrase here adjusts and elaborates the Latin in line with the annotation *neque nubunt neque ducunt uxores* (on 20:35), which corrected the Latin of verse 35, saying that while Greek uses one verb, γαμεῖν 'to marry,' first in the active voice of men marrying and then in the middle-passive of women being married or given in marriage, Latin idiom requires two different expressions entirely: *uxorem (in matrimonium) ducere* 'to take a wife (in marriage)' of men and expressions based on *nubere* for women, 'to wed, be(come) a bride.' The Vulgate translator had these reversed, producing literally 'they neither become brides nor take wives.' A similar adjustment is found two sentences above, in the paraphrase on verse 34.

'After all, even Moses himself teaches you that it is possible for the dead to rise again and that souls do not die when bodies do,' he said. 'Since you acknowledge his authority in other matters you ought not reject it here. In fact he reported in writing that from the bush he had seen burning but not consumed God spoke to him as follows: "I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob." Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were already in their tombs, but if, as you think, whoever dies perishes completely and irrecoverably, how is it that God calls himself God of those who do not exist? For since God himself is living, or rather is life itself, it is incongruent for him to call himself God of those who have already utterly perished in death.

'But those whose better part survives, that is, the part whereby we are alive, have not perished. In other animals death is destruction; in fact, the body collapses when deprived of life, and the soul, which in them is nothing other than a harmony of the qualities of the body, also vanishes when the compound is dissolved.[37] In human beings death is nothing more than the sundering of soul from body, in such a way that the better part of us remains unharmed; the body alone is temporarily not destroyed but corrupted. It ought not surprise you that in the resurrection the body is restored by divine power, since every day you see that from the dry grain

* * * * *

37 The vocabulary and thought sound as if they ought to have classical and Christian precedent. As for the thought, theories that soul is a *harmonia* were held by Pythagoras, Empedocles, and many others; but Aristotle and his followers, including scholastic theologians, dismissed all such theories and held that soul was a distinct elemental substance in itself. I am not aware of any source that distinguishes between human immortal souls and animal mortal souls on the ground that the latter but not the former are only a harmony of corporeal parts. For representative discussions see Plato *Phaedo* 85E–86D and 92A–95C, Aristotle *De anima* 407b–408a, Lucretius *De rerum natura* 3.98–135, Cicero *Tusculan Disputations* 1.24 and 41, Origen *Contra Celsum* 4.74–99, Alexander of Aphrodisias *De anima* 1.53–67, Gregory of Nyssa *De anima* PG 45 194D–196D, William of Auvergne *De anima* 2.1 and 5.3 in *Opera omnia* (2 vols 1674; repr Frankfurt am Main 1963), Thomas Aquinas *Quaestiones de anima* 1. However, though Aristotle and his successors reject the definition of soul as harmony, they do assert that the existence and operation of animal souls depend entirely on body. So, according to William of Auvergne, when the body collapses the soul is destroyed, like water when the pitcher breaks or wood when the fire goes out, *De immortalitate animae* 331; cf his *De anima* 1.6 and 5.22 and Thomas Aquinas *Summa theologiae* I qu 75 art 3. For the scholastics it is the rational or intellectual part of the human soul, by which God can be perceived, that is immortal.

of seed cast into the earth and rotted there a new living tree springs up, a tree that was concealed in the tiny dead bit of buried seed.[38] Likewise those who are dead are indeed dead to you, who have no power to recall them to life; but they all live to God, even the dead, for he has it in his power to restore the sundered souls to their respective bodies whenever he wishes.'

While the Sadducees had nothing to say to this, certain scribes gave their approval of Jesus' words, because on this point there was agreement between the scribes and the Pharisees as against the sect of the Sadducees. But though the view of the scribes and Pharisees in this regard was more correct than that of the Sadducees, their heart was on that account more criminal. For there is less evil where there is more ignorance. So after he had been tested by various sects of the Jews (for he had also given the Pharisees the answer about the great commandment)[39] and the attempt had not turned out well for anyone of them, no one dared to harass him with further questions.

Jesus then went on to challenge those who were gathered together not with a loaded question but with one that concerned their salvation. He asked whose son Scripture said the Messiah would be. They were well aware of the prediction that he would be born of the lineage of David, so they promptly replied, 'David's.'[40] To this Jesus said, 'But David, by inspiration of the heavenly Spirit, speaks about the Messiah in the Psalms like this: "The Lord said to my Lord, 'Sit at my right hand, till I make your enemies a footstool under your feet."' How can it be right that he calls "lord" one whom he recognizes as a son? For a son is less than his father, and it is more proper for the son to call his father lord[41] as a mark of honour than vice versa.'

* * * * *

38 For 'corruption' (in the Vulg and AV) of the body in death and for the seed as an analogue to death and resurrection, see John 12:24 and 1 Cor 15:36–54.

39 In this Gospel the account of the great commandment and its twin occurs much earlier than the present incident, at 10:25–7, but in Matthew it is told immediately after Jesus' answer to the Sadducees' question, at Matt 22:34–8. Erasmus' mention of it here may be influenced by his general attention to Matthew and the commentators on Matthew as he works through Luke; cf references to Matthew throughout these notes. In both the Matthew passage and Luke's version the 'lawyer' who questions Jesus and elicits the great commandment as an answer is said to be testing him, at the instigation of the Pharisees or at least in their hearing.

40 In Luke no answer to the question is recorded; this answer is given at Matt 22:42.

41 *dominus*. Cf the Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited.

No one could solve this problem, and at that point it was enough for Jesus to have signified in a riddle his divine nature, according to which he was greater than all the patriarchs, indeed even equal to God his father, though he surpassed everyone according to his human nature also. They preserved a very sacred memory of David; him whom David acknowledged as both son and Lord they scorned, not out of ignorance of the Law but out of a judgment blinded by depraved impulses.

Now since their evildoing was deplorable and not to be cured by any remedies, it remained for the simple and ignorant crowd of people to be warned not to be outwitted by the deceits and crafts of these men, who though they were empty of all religion still made a pretence of the highest godliness, looking to no other end than their own glory and gain, and for this reason in every way obstructing the glory of God and the salvation of their neighbours. For there are no worse enemies of true godliness than those who by a pretence of sanctimony win authority for themselves, and relying on it call the simple people away from true godliness. This class of actor[42] suffers especially from a double disease: from self-seeking that verges on tyranny, and from insatiable greed. Jesus sketched them for his disciples, and did it with the whole people listening, so that those who could not be corrected would be avoided, and those who refused to repent would cease to deceive. This was not defamation of another's character but consideration for the salvation of the simple.

Now listen, my dear Theophilus, to the colours in which the Lord paints them, so that you may shun them once known. 'Guard yourselves,' he said, 'from scribes like the ones you often see attacking me with their tricks. They profess knowledge of the Law, and fight stubbornly against the sense of the Law. They have God in their mouth, but they oppose God's glory.[43] They profess that they care for the people's welfare, when for the sake of their own comfort they make a pretence of all that they do. They flee the companionship of sinners, and if they happen into a gathering of them they cleanse themselves with ritual washings; but inside they are completely drenched in fouler vices: thirst for empty glory, contempt, envy, but most of all greed, which is idol-worship.[44] What is more, since they understand that the people are most stirred by visible things, by manipulation of such things they grasp at authority in the eyes of the simple. They advertise themselves

* * * * *

42 'Actor' is *histrio*. For more examples of Erasmus' introduction of stage language into the *Paraphrases*, see the paraphrase on 22:4–5 and n7 there.

43 Cf Jer 7:4 and the paraphrase on John 5:42–3 CWE 46 72.

44 Cf Eph 5:5.

by novelty in dress, taking delight in strolling about conspicuously in grand full-length stoles and with their faces set in solemn expressions; they are forever busy in the forum and in public gatherings so that they may be treated respectfully there and greeted as Rabbini.[45] Likewise in synagogues and synods they jockey for the first place seating, and at dinner parties they seek out the more honoured place at table so that they can seem important to other people though to God they are accursed.

'They could seem only idle and foolish if they were soliciting nothing more than popular fancy and the puffery of honorific greeting. Nothing is more rapacious than they. They do not practice usury, they are not tax collectors, but they have their ways, more wicked than the way of those sorts. They ferret out the simpler type of people for their prey, they grasp at wealthy widows bereft of a husband's protection. The sex is apt to be deceived, and it appears a pious act to offer help to the bereaved. And so they impose on them easily with their pretence of sanctimony. They parade the maximum of solemnity on their faces, they are honoured by everyone, their very clothing shouts out their sanctimony. They add long-winded prayers, especially in public. This was a practice of John and the ancient prophets too, but in private. These fellows are not at prayer but in pursuit. So what wonder if widows are taken in by so many false appearances? When they have sidled up to these women they devour their houses and rob the ones they should have protected, and what was supposed to be spent on the poor they turn to their own gain.'

Such were the scribes and Pharisees at that time, who fought endlessly against the gospel. And yet there are today and always will be scribes who while they work for their own advantage and oppose the people's advantage also resist the glory of Jesus, and they do it by a false show of religion. By worshipping, by honorific titles, by long-winded prayers they chase after a reputation for sanctimony in the eyes of ordinary folk who do not yet understand in what things true religion is to be found. But what will Christ's disciples do against them, disciples who do not know how to do harm, since they are endowed with dovelike simplicity? Surely here they will also use the serpent's cunning.[46] If having been warned they do not repent, they are to be shunned as incurable, and the simple are to be advised to beware of their traps. Their punishment awaits them. For on arrival at the tribunal of the judge who does not judge according to things that are seen with the body's eyes but according to the secret impulses

* * * * *

45 Cf the paraphrases on 11:43 and on 14:6 above.
46 Cf Matt 10:16.

in their hearts, they will be assigned heavier penalties than those who are simply and openly wrongdoers and the less harmful because they parade their disease before them.

Chapter 21

Now Jesus wanted to fix it more deeply in the hearts of the people that humans are not judged before God according to their visible possessions but according to their sincerity of heart; at the same time he wanted to rebuke the greed of the scribes, Pharisees, and priests, who urged upon the people, but especially upon the widows, mere women but rich, that the height of holiness was theirs if they contributed as much as possible of their wealth to the corban, bypassing the poor and sometimes even their own children and parents. So as he sat in the temple, he raised his eyes[1] to the place called the offering-box, in which the gifts were kept. The priests so much wanted that money to be considered sacred that while the Law bade parents be honoured first and foremost, they taught that one's father was to be abandoned rather than the corban not be increased – and yet the money was already largely diverted by the priests' wrongdoing to their self-indulgence.[2] Now when many rich men had put many things in the offering-box, and had been applauded as godly people by the priests and Pharisees, a poor widow also came up, who put in two copper coins, which make a quarter-penny. None of the men applauded her, yet Jesus wanted the godliness of this woman to be known to the people. For he said, 'This widow seems in human judgment to have put very little into the offering-box. But in God's judgment she has put in more than those rich men who contributed very handsomely. They are liberal from the surplus they have

* * * * *

1 *sustulit oculos.* In the annotation *respiciens autem* (on 21:1) Erasmus remarked that the Vulgate's verb *respicere* means 'to look behind,' whereas the Greek word being translated, ἀναβλέψας, means either 'recovering one's sight' or 'lifting one's eyes in order to see.' He adapts the wording of the paraphrase accordingly.

2 The Gospel text here speaks only of the *gazophylacium* 'offering-box.' 'Corban' appears in Matt 27:6 and Mark 7:11 (neither a parallel to this episode). Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 27 PL 26 213A had explained the corban as the *gazophylacium,* the word also in 2 Kings 12:9 for the offering-box set up at the right of the altar in the restored Temple. The Mark passage has Jesus criticizing the scribes and Pharisees for elevating gifts to the corban above honouring one's father and mother; the imputation that such elevation was motivated by the priests' avarice is made by Nicholas of Lyra (on Mark 7:11).

at home. But she, in her zeal for godliness, gave out of her poverty and put everything she had at home to live on into the offering-box.[3] Hence before God, who does not look at the material means but at the heart, she contributed more generously than they did.'[4]

In this way Jesus everywhere and at every opportunity called his followers from reliance on visible things, to which the Jews ascribed too much, towards zeal for gospel godliness, which is rooted in the honest feelings of the heart. The Jews indeed had their chief glory in the Jerusalem temple, which, elaborately built and enriched with magnificent gifts, was visited in great reverence not only by all the Jews but by foreigners too. Now, however, the time had come when reverence for that temple would cease along with its sacrifices, and the temple of the heart, sanctified by the Holy Spirit, would be prepared for God, in which sacrifices most pleasing to him would be offered daily: not sacrifices of beasts but of prayers and thanksgivings. For a pure heart, even any pauper's heart, is a holier and more magnificent temple to God than that lavishly appointed temple erected over so many years.[5] Chastity, self-restraint, love are ornaments far more precious in God's sight than the marble, ivory, cedar, gold, silver, and jewels on which the priests and Pharisees prided themselves.

So when some of them were showing Jesus the marvellous construction of the temple, which had been built with unusual stones, polished and carved with great skill, and which had been ornamented with splendid gifts, he replied, 'Prepare for God a spiritual temple that time will not erode nor storm demolish nor fire consume nor any human violence de-

* * * * *

3 The rich give *quod ipsis ... superest* 'the surplus they have' a rephrasing that follows Erasmus' preferred translation of the Greek in the annotation *ex abundantia sibi* (on 21:4). Similarly in the annotation *ex eo quod deest* (on 21:4) he preferred *ex penuria* 'out of her poverty' for the Vulgate text, not illogically, for the Vulgate literally means 'from what was lacking.' The difficulty in the Vulgate's Latin is also remarked by Hugh of St Cher (on 21:4) 253r. In the annotation *omnem victum* (on 21:4) Erasmus had suggested *totam substantiam* 'everything she had to live on' and noted that the Vulgate translator had elsewhere said *substantia* for the Greek *βίος* here translated as *victus*. Cf chapter 15 n16 above.

4 Like Erasmus in this sentence and in the opening of this chapter, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 583C–D says that whatever we give to God with a good intention is acceptable to him, for he considers the heart and not the fortune of the giver.

5 Cf John 4:21–4 (for the heart as the new locale for worship), 12:20 (for non-Jews visiting the Jerusalem temple), and the paraphrases on those passages CWE 46 58 and 152. For the length of time to build the temple, cf John 2:20.

stroy.[6] For all that you marvel at now as worthy of God will be razed to the foundations so completely that not one stone will be left undamaged and attached to another.'

When the disciples heard this and concluded from it that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, which they thought would happen with some great alteration of the world, they were eager to learn the time when it would happen, and said to the Lord, 'Teacher, these things you say about the destruction of the temple and the overthrow of Jerusalem – when will they happen, or by what sign will we be able to know that the time is close?' But Jesus wanted his followers to be always prepared for every assault of evil, so he kept their hearts in suspense with ambiguous words, mixing together much about the sufferings they would endure for preaching the gospel, about the overthrow and dire destruction of the city of Jerusalem, and about the end of the world, whose time he wanted to remain unknown to everyone, so that they would always be prepared. The disciples were thinking about a kingdom, but the Lord preferred them to know what concerned them more and what the heart of the weak shied away from hearing mentioned. For they wanted to hear pleasant things rather than wholesome ones.[7] That blessed[8] kingdom will come someday, and will come in its own good time; it is better to leave concern about it to God. In the

* * * * *

6 The spiritual temple may owe something to Eph 2:21 and Erasmus' paraphrase on it (LB VII 978D), where he uses the term 'spiritual temple.' This sentence, however, seems more akin to Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1897D–1898B; there Ambrose remarks that the destruction of Solomon's temple at the judgment is meant, since there is nothing made by human hands that is not either destroyed by time, brought down by violence, or consumed by fire (*quod non aut vetustas conficiat aut vis subruat aut ignis exurat*). His allegorical interpretation is that as a body of believers, the synagogue is replaced by the church, and that on the individual level, there is a spiritual temple for each believer that will fall if faith is weakened but that supplies all spiritual needs for the one firm in faith.

7 Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1898C says that when Jesus answered the disciples' question of verse 7 he told them about the signs but did not think it necessary to clarify when they would come; Hugh of St Cher (on 21:7) 253V has a similar comment. Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 75 (76) (on Matt 21:1–6) PG 58 687–8 says that the disciples believe they will not be affected by the overthrow of Jerusalem and are only looking forward to the good things that will quickly follow it; Jesus, however, gives them a sobering answer about the perils they will face, wishing to keep them alert and on guard about what concerns them more immediately.

8 *beatum*, the reading of the lifetime editions, though LB only reports it in a note as found in 'another edition'

meantime it is our task to conduct ourselves in such a way that we do not appear unworthy of the kingdom. For there is no coming to the glory of the kingdom except through sufferings of various kinds. It is against them that our hearts should be armed.

Jesus therefore said, 'I am assuredly going to come and reveal the majesty of the gospel kingdom. But see that you are not misled, embracing some other Christ instead of me. For before the time when I am to come, many will come who will claim my name for themselves and declare of themselves, "I am the Christ;[9] the time is at hand." Do not be moved by the words of such people, and no matter where they call you, do not follow. Then when you hear that everything is in turmoil with uprisings and wars, many will prophesy that the end of the world is at hand. But do not be frightened by rumours of this kind, as if the last day were imminent. Such things will certainly happen, but the end of the world will not follow immediately. In fact these will be nothing other than preludes to the ultimate catastrophe that will destroy the wicked and weigh out and cleanse the good. As severe illnesses are signs of the imminent death of the body, arising from a faulty balance of its components, so the end of the world is foretold by the dread turmoils which mortals, infected[10] with base lusts, bring upon themselves. Nature herself will be shaken by their perversity, as if denouncing human wickedness and rising up to avenge their crimes. Nation will rise up against nation in great turmoils, and kingdom against kingdom. Indeed, though nothing is more disastrous than war, yet human beings cause this plague and call it forth by their self-seeking, stupidity, greed, hatred, and similar vicious urges.

'Nature herself will also contribute severe earthquakes in many places, as if the world is offended at being compelled to endure such unholy human beings. There will be epidemics, too, that with their contagion will carry off great numbers of people, as if the very air is armed for vengeance against the wicked, though it has been given to bestow and nourish life in everyone with its healthful breeze. And there will be famine from poor

* * * * *

9 *ego sum Christus*. Cf Matt 24:23. In adding 'Christ' to Luke's text 'many will come in my name saying, "I am [he],"' Erasmus follows his annotation *dicentes quia ego sum* (on 21:8), where he explained that Jesus means that many will say that they are the Christ though he is; Erasmus' revised Latin text of the Gospel makes the same clarification. The Latin text without this addition could be understood to mean that Jesus foretold many saying that he existed or was alive.

10 *infecti*, the reading of the lifetime editions, though LB prints *inducti* 'led' and reports 'the other edition' as reading *infecti*

harvests, as if the earth is refusing her nourishment to children so impious towards God, whom even the brute elements serve. The sea will be stirred by strange and unusual turmoils, though it too is accustomed to serve the needs of humankind.[11] Why, even the very sky will give forth ominous signs in witness to the wrath of God: the sun suddenly turned to darkness, the moon to blood, comets showing themselves in new forms, and other strange and awesome prodigies.[12] Indeed, even the human body does not die instantly when struck down by massive illness, but repeated occurrence of the illnesses makes plain that the day of death is not far off. Likewise when the world is repeatedly shaken by ills of this kind, they will be the mark of a world grown old and heading towards collapse.[13]

'But before this general catastrophe seizes upon the earth, first will come a notable human wickedness that will provoke God's goodness to wrath. For as you preach my name, through which people can be saved, they will lay hands on you and persecute you with all manner of evil. They will drag you into their council chambers as if you are criminals and evildoers. They will cast you into prison, they will have you up on charges before the tribunals of kings and governors, not for any wrongdoing of

* * * * *

11 Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1052A says that pestilence will come from air befouled by the bodies of the slain and famine from fields not being cultivated. For Erasmus' views on foul and fresh air, and the relation of pestilence to them, cf Ep 1532. Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 35 PL 76 1260A, followed by Hugh of St Cher (on 21:11) 254r, after rehearsing the signs of verse 11 and their moral meaning, summarizes by saying that everything we have received to carry on life we have turned to the practice of evil, but they will all turn in vengeance against us.

12 For Erasmus' amplification of the celestial prodigies mentioned in verse 11, cf Joel 2:31, repeated in Acts 2:20 and Rev 6:12, and the celestial prodigies surrounding the destruction of the Temple as reported by Josephus *Jewish War* 6.288–300; Josephus is cited in connection with this verse by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 586B, followed by the *Gloss* (on 21:11), Hugh of St. Cher (on 21:11) 253v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 21:11), who all mention the appearance of a star or comet shaped like a sword and other prodigies. Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 75 (76) PG 58 690 (on Matt 24:1–15) also refers his hearers to Josephus for a thorough description of the famine, pestilence, earthquakes, and other miseries at the fall of Jerusalem.

13 Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1899A speaks of the signs in verses 10–11 as 'illnesses' (*aegritudines*) of a world near its collapse, though without making an explicit comparison to the human body. Erasmus uses the analogy of individual illness and death with the coming of the end of the world above, on verse 9, and below, on verse 37.

yours but for a great good deed, that is, for the proclamation of my name, which they will try in every way to wipe out, although through it the free attainment of eternal salvation is possible. Yet this will happen to you so that on the one hand your steadfastness may be proved and on the other their wickedness may be understood as rightly condemned.[14] But you, relying on my protection and your own innocence, will have no reason to fear their tribunals, or to plan anxiously how you, being uneducated men, will argue your case before a session of nobles or princes. And there is no reason for you to employ a public orator, advocate, or legal scholar as your spokesman. Through my Spirit I will be with you as invincible advocate and spokesman, one who will supply you with both words and wisdom, whom all your opponents, however cruel or eloquent in worldly wisdom, will not be able to resist or gainsay.

'And you will suffer this not only at the hands of persons unknown and strangers but also at the hands of those who are bound to you by close kinship and the strictest bonds of intimacy. Father will persecute son, brothers will attack their brother, kinsman will indict kinsman, friend will summon friend to law. What is more, there will be those of you whom they are going to kill out of hatred for me. Such cruel hatred will the world conceive against you for the confession of my name.

'To be sure, whatever they dare against you I will take as done to insult me.[15] So there is no reason for you to think about vengeance. I shall be wronged, I shall be slain in your persons. It will be mine both to take thought for your welfare and to avenge their evil. However much the storms of human persecution rage against you, there is no reason for you to be afraid, because, you see, I am your protector. For I shall not allow even a hair of your head to perish, so far am I from failing you. Do not look to human defences: troops, arms, artillery; only by your endurance will you defend your life.[16] One who is killed for the confession of my name

* * * * *

14 The Latin exegetical tradition repeats the saying of Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 35 PL 76 1261A on the testimony or witness in verse 13, that the same event, the death of the righteous, is an aid to the good because from it they take a model and live, but for the wicked it is a witness against them that they will perish without a plea. So Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 586C, the *Gloss* (on 21:13), and Hugh of St Cher (on 21:13) 254v; Hugh adds as an alternative that the witness is the apostles' witness of truth, or obedience to divine love.

15 Cf John 15:18–21 and the paraphrase on that passage CWE 46 179–81.

16 Noël Béda objected to this passage on the grounds that Erasmus was claiming that Christians are not permitted to repel force with force; in the *Divinationes*

cannot perish. You will not perish before your time.[17] For I shall not allow so much to human violence. Indeed, one who for my sake meets death with steadfastness will truly save his soul.[18]

'This wealthy city, however, on which the Jews now pride themselves and in which they think they reign supreme, will be completely overthrown by the gentiles. So when you see Jerusalem besieged, understand that its devastation threatens, and that there is nothing left but for each one to look out for himself by as speedy an escape as possible. Each person in wartime generally soothes himself with hope of victory; beware lest anyone be deceived by this hope. Whoever is on the borders of Judea at that time should betake himself to trackless mountain places; those who live in the central part of Judea should move away elsewhere. Those whom this calamity overtakes in neighbouring districts should not come back into Judea. They should consider everything lost; each one should only look out for his own life. These things will not come about because of chance human uprisings; God's vengeance, already long provoked by the persistent wickedness of humankind, through foreign nations will exact punishment from this nation, long since in rebellion against God. That these things would come in this way was once foretold by the prophets, especially Daniel.[19] Furthermore, whatever Scripture has foretold would come to pass must come, for Scripture does not deceive, since it is written by inspiration of the divine Spirit. But this catastrophe will occur not because the prophets foretold that it would be so; rather, it was foretold because God foresaw the obstinate ungodliness of humanity, by which they would call down divine vengeance on themselves. And the storm of evils will be vast, since it has been preceded by long-lasting and persistent wickedness on the part of this race,

* * * * *

LB IX 493C Erasmus reiterated his conviction that Scripture forbids Christians to use physical force in self-defence. Cf the paraphrase on 22:36 and nn36 and 37 there.

17 *non peribitis ante diem.* Cf Virgil *Aeneid* 4.696–7, describing the death of Dido: *nec fato merita nec morte peribat, / sed misera ante diem* 'Deserving neither her fate nor her death did she perish, / but unhappy, before her time.'

18 Erasmus pointed out in the annotation *possidebitis* (on 21:19) that the Greek aorist imperative should have been translated by a Latin present imperative, 'possess!' not the future indicative 'you will possess.' In the paraphrase the only imperative appears in the amplifying contrary statement 'do not look to human defences'; future indicatives 'will you defend,' 'you will not perish,' and 'will truly save' accommodate the traditional Vulgate reading.

19 Eg Dan 9:20–27. Daniel is quoted (and named) at Matt 24:15, and he and other prophets in the following verses, Matt 24:15–31.

which, summoned to repentance in so many ways, has always gone to the worse.

'This tempest will embroil both the guilty and the innocent. But those whom the breaking storm of evils finds ready to run will be less unfortunate. Woe to pregnant and nursing women, because, hampered by a burden that they will neither wish nor be able to put down, they will not be free to run away.[20] And there will be no hope of safety except in running away. It will be no ordinary affliction; the dreadful vengeance of God will seize all this territory and this people, rebels these many ages long. For when their cities have been overthrown, they will be either slaughtered or led away captive to be scattered through all the nations of the world, so that, the world turned upside down, they will be slaves to the gentiles that till now they have cursed as godforsaken; yet they will owe to the humanity of the gentiles the very fact that there are any remains of the impious race surviving. Why, even Jerusalem here, proud in her wealth and her reputation for religiosity, with her temple, whose walls they tell themselves will be everlasting, will be trampled down by gentiles, until the times are fulfilled in which God will allow the Jewish nation to be crushed and afflicted by uncircumcised gentiles, until the Jews, long disciplined by evil, finally repent and enter with the gentiles into the fellowship of the gospel proclamation.[21] For that is going to happen before the world's final day comes.

'What is more, many signs will foretell that hour's arrival before it comes. For it will be a fearsome day, especially for those who scorn my present time, a peaceable time, in acts of kindness freely inviting them to repentance. But then the elements of the universe will seem to shudder at

* * * * *

20 Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 76 (77) PG 58 694 (on Matt 24:16–17) says that pregnant women are unable to put their burden down, and nursing mothers cannot disregard the welfare of their infants. Theophylact restates the same idea, *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1056B–C. Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 24 PL 26 185A–B says that the same two groups of women, weighed down by the 'burden' (*sarcina*) of their unborn and infant children, are unable to take up an 'unhindered' or 'free' (*expeditam*) flight. Jerome is echoed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 588B and the *Gloss* (on 21:23). Erasmus uses some of Jerome's language: *sarcina* 'burden' and *expeditae* 'free.' 'Nursing women' is *mamma lactantibus*. The Vulgate reading is *nutrientibus* 'nursing,' 'nourishing,' 'fostering,' 'rearing'; this Latin word is not limited to breast-feeding. In the annotation *et nutrientibus* (on 21:23) Erasmus explained that the Greek word being translated does have that specific meaning and cites Ambrose's and Augustine's readings of other more exact Latin terminology; he adopts his point in the paraphrase here.

21 Cf Rom 11:25–6, the eventual salvation of the Jews.

that day's approach. The sun, the source of light, that regularly gladdens the face of the natural world, will veil its countenance in sudden darkness. Not even the moon will have its borrowed light to bestow on you. The stars, red with blood, will come down from the sky onto the earth.[22] And violent mental anguish and universal despair will seize all nations, as the ocean swells and the grim crashing waves resound.[23]

'These portents and others like them, which will come out of every corner of the earth, will announce the onset of the terrible vengeance of God; and therefore mortals will weaken and faint[24] in fear and anticipation of the things that will soon overtake the entire world. For the whole of the natural world will be rocked: not only will land and sea be utterly changed, but even the solidest components of the universe, which have thus far been exempt from exchange of elements and have regularly only acted on the things subject to them without in turn being affected by them, will be shaken.[25]

* * * * *

22 For the elaboration of verse 25 in general, cf verse 11 and the paraphrase on it above, and especially the OT passages cited in concordances here and in the synoptic parallels: eg Isa 13:10, Joel 2:10 and 31, 3:15, Ps 46:2–3 (45:4 Vulg) and 65:7 (64:8 Vulg). Some of these are also cited in treatments of verse 25 by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 589B–C and Hugh of St Cher (on 21:25) 255V.

23 Erasmus' 'violent mental anguish and universal despair' (*vehemens animorum anxietas ac rerum desperatio*) represents the Vulgate *pressura gentium prae confusione* 'distress of nations in perplexity' and reflects his comment in the annotation *pressura* (on 21:25) that *anxietas* is preferable to *pressura* as a translation of the Greek *συνοχή*. Similarly in the annotation *prae confusione* (on 21:25) he said that *in perplexitate* or *desperatione* would translate *ἐν ἀπορίᾳ* better than the Vulgate expression; his paraphrase adapts his second option. The vivid description of the sea and its roaring, besides its similarity to the passages from the Psalms cited in the preceding note, also reflects the annotation *sonitus maris* (on 21:25), where Erasmus noted that 'as the sea resounds' would translate the Greek better than the Vulgate's 'the sound of the sea.'

24 *extabescent et exanimabuntur.* Erasmus' annotation *arescentibus hominibus* (on 21:26) preferred the verbs *extabescere* or *exanimari* as translations of the Greek, where the Vulgate has *arescere* 'dry up.'

25 This sentence paraphrases *virtutes coelorum commovebuntur* 'the powers of the heavens will be shaken.' The phrase is duplicated in Matt 24:29 and identical in meaning to one in Mark 13:25, both parallels of this passage; its roots in OT prophecy can be found in Bible commentaries. The exegetical tradition on all three passages understood the 'powers of heaven' as angels. Thomas Aquinas *Summa theologiae* III suppl qu 73 art 3 says that they are the angels whose task it is to move the heavenly bodies, which in turn are the cause of natural activity below them, and that their being shaken means that they will cease to produce celestial motion. None of this explains why Erasmus speaks here

'Those who in this present time have scorned the Son of Man, peaceful, mild, and a doer of good deeds, will see him in those days, but to their own harm will they see him, on high, coming in a cloud, with great power and the highest glory. So, when these things begin to take place, lift up your eyes and raise your heads to the heavenly city of Jerusalem, for the kingdom of God will be near, in which there will no longer be any affliction from evils, but unending peace and everlasting bliss. These will be the surest signs that the last day is at hand.'

And the Lord added a comparison. 'Take an example from the trees, which warn people by definite signs of the fruit that will follow. For you see the fig and the other trees when they sprout buds and leaves, and you understand without being told that summer is at hand, and you begin to hope for the fruits.[26] Likewise, when you see these preludes to the transformation of the world, form a sure hope that soon the kingdom of God is to be brought forth and that evil persons will no longer have a right to afflict the good; but the godless will be visited with everlasting punishment and the godly will enjoy perpetual delights. If you have seen anything happening that was foretold you before now by the prophets and by me, believe that without a doubt these things too that I have just foretold to you will come to pass. I tell you, this mortal age will not pass before all these things come about. Nothing is more stable than earth and sky; but earth and sky will vanish more swiftly than my words will pass away empty.

'Assured, then, that this fearful time will come, prepare yourselves for its arrival, lest you be half-asleep when it falls upon you. You will prepare if you make sure that your hearts are not weighed down with dissipation and drunkenness and the other preoccupations of this present

* * * * *

of the 'solidest components of the universe' (*solidissima mundi corpora*) that are normally exempt from physical change. Nor does he speak of angels in the paraphrases on the synoptic parallels, though the paraphrase on Mark 13:25 does identify the function of the 'powers' more nearly as Thomas does; cf CWE 49 154–5.

26 'Sprout buds and leaves' is *protrudunt gemmas ac frondes*. In the annotation *cum produxerint ex se fructum* (on 21:30) Erasmus remarked that the Greek text here has only a verb, προβάλωσιν 'put forth,' with no direct object, where the Vulgate reading adds *ex se fructum* 'their fruit.' But Jesus does not mean, he says, the fruit itself but the buds and emerging leaves, as is clear in the synoptic parallels (Matt 24:32, Mark 13:28). In the same annotation he commented that the Vulgate omits *ex vobis ipsis* as an equivalent to the Greek ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν 'of yourselves,' meaning 'without anyone reminding you'; he includes the expression in the paraphrase, translated here 'without being told.'

life. Instead, live as if that day is soon to come, loving nothing in this world but wholeheartedly intent on heavenly things. Thus it will happen that that day will not fall upon you unexpectedly.[27] As for the others, indeed, who live as if this time will never come, the day will come like a snare stealthily placed by a trapper, and it will entangle all those who do not have their hearts and eyes lifted up to heaven but who live on the surface of the earth, where we have no fixed abode but are hurrying to the everlasting one. And they indeed, their attention elsewhere, will find themselves caught before they notice the snare. Lest the same thing become habitual with you, shun drowsiness; do not dream over the pleasures and cares of this world. Be always awake in study of heavenly things, and pray continuously that God find you worthy to be included among those who will be able to escape[28] these great and universal dangers and to stand before the inevitable judge, the Son of Man. For though now with great mildness he invites everyone to penitence, then he will judge the living and the dead with great sternness. Let no one rely on his own resources; no one will endure this judgment except forearmed with God's favour. He will only aid those who are now trying with all their energy to show themselves worthy of that favour. It will be too late to implore his mercy then, if they are misusing his mildness now.'

But since the time of his death was near, our Lord Jesus taught his disciples by his own example that they must chiefly be awake and alert in godly pursuits at the time when the last day of their life looms. For what the last day, of which he had just foretold many things, is to the world, that is what each person's death day is to him. So the Lord taught the people in the temple by day, not ceasing to do good to those by whom he knew he

* * * * *

27 Erasmus' emphasis, in this sentence and the three preceding, on Christians' deliberately watchful expectation of the second coming parallels the final part of his annotation *cum produxerint ex se fructum* (on 21:30), where he ended a series of corrections of the Vulgate translations from Greek by noting that the Vulgate's *ne forte* 'lest by chance (you are weighed down)' in verse 34, intended to translate μήποτε 'lest at any time,' suggests that drunkenness and the other problems of human life are matters of chance rather than of human responsibility. Here as there he dismisses such a view.

28 In the annotation *ut digni habeamini* (on 21:36) Erasmus said that the Vulgate text *ut digni habeamini fugere* 'that you may be held worthy to escape,' translating the Greek καταξιώθητε, would be better expressed as *digni reddamini qui possitis effugere* 'that you be rendered worthy to be able to escape,' and that the meaning in any case is that they should pray to be able to escape. Modern texts give a different reading of the Greek that confirms this interpretation; cf Nestle-Aland on the text and Fitzmyer AB Luke 1356.

would be killed; at night, however, he moved out to Mt Olivet, so that he could be freer for prayer, in which he continually besought his Father for the salvation of the world, giving minimal time to sleep.[29] And the people came to him at daybreak in the temple to hear him teach.[30]

Chapter 22

The more the people hung on the words[1] of the Lord, the more and more were the priests, scribes, and Pharisees, in league with the leaders of the people, goaded to the killing of Jesus. The appointed time was also now approaching when it was proper for the victim to be sacrificed for the salvation of the entire human race. For the day that was by far the most sacred of all among the Jews had been chosen for this purpose, the one they called the day of Unleavened Bread, because it was unlawful for Jews to eat leavened bread during the days of that festival; and it is also called Phase or Pascha, which means Passover in Syrian, from the yearling lamb whose blood was smeared on the upper parts of the doorposts of their houses, so that the angel of the Lord, the slayer of all who did not have this mark on their doors, would pass them by.[2]

* * * * *

29 That Jesus preferred praying to sleeping is probably deduced from 9:28–36, Matt 14:22–5, and his prayer in Gethsemane, 22:39–46 and the parallel passages in the other Gospels. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 592A–B, followed by the *Gloss* (on 21:37), draws a similar moral between Jesus' alternating preaching and prayer in verse 37 and his teaching about our disposition towards the Last Judgment in verses 34–6. Bede also makes the analogy between preparation for the universal Last Judgment and for each individual's death.

30 'Came to him at daybreak' is *diluculo ventitabat*. The Vulgate verb for which Erasmus has substituted this expression is *manicabat*, otherwise unknown in Latin but apparently formed from *mane* 'in the morning.' In *Annot in Lucam* 21 Valla had pointed out that the Vulgate translator used it nowhere else, even to translate the same Greek word in Ps 63:2, and offered a number of alternative expressions. Erasmus said in the annotation *et omnis populus manicabat* (on 21:38) that a very old Latin text read *diluculo veniebat*. He uses a closely related expression in the paraphrase.

1 *pendebat ab ore*, a poetic Latin expression used eg by Virgil *Aeneid* 4.79 of Dido listening to Aeneas and by Ovid *Heroides* 1.30 in Penelope's description of a wife listening to her husband's account of his travels. Cf chapter 19 n67 above.

2 The Gospel text explains the festival of Unleavened Bread as Pascha; Erasmus adds Phase and its interpretation as the 'Syrian' (that is, Aramaic) for *transitus* 'Passover.' Cf Jerome *De nominibus Hebraicis* CCL 72 140 and 148 and the paraphrase on John 1:38 CWE 46 33 with n126. The Latin exegetical tradition

This day was not at all convenient for the priests and scribes, who had preferred his death to be unnoticed and indistinguishable from the common punishment of criminals. But Jesus wanted his death to be widely known and marked by ceremony, and to match the Old Testament symbols and the pronouncements of the prophets in every regard. For he was the lamb innocent of every blemish, by whose flesh true Israelites throughout the world are daily made new,[3] by whose most holy blood we are washed clean, taken out of death's clutches, set free from the tyranny of sin; and daily retreating further from Egypt, we hasten towards the heavenly land that abounds with every kind of bliss, while here and now we abstain from leavened bread and dwell in the simplicity and sincerity of the gospel spirit.[4] Hence this day was chosen by God for that true sacrifice, though it did not suit the Pharisees. He did not die by the Jews' choice, but by his Father's and his own choice, when he wished, where he wished, and as he wished. For nothing was done here randomly or by chance. The wickedness of the Pharisees, continually plotting death for the Lord as they were, had been without effect until now, because while they had no lack of evil intention, God gave them no capacity to carry out what they had planned. Even so, they kept on forming and combining their schemes as if with their own resources they could accomplish what they wanted. For the wickedness of the scribes and Pharisees, provoked in many ways, was eager to lay hands on the Lord and drag him off to die. But their fear of the people prevented them, who they saw had been won over to him by the miracles and good deeds he performed and now hung on his words. Hence there was a risk that if they tried to lay hands on him in the presence of a crowd, he would be forcibly snatched from their grasp in the ensuing uproar and the attempt would come to nothing – in fact, having escaped once,

* * * * *

explains the Passover event and its commemoration; cf Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 592C, the *Gloss* (on 22:1), Hugh of St Cher (on 22:1) 257V, Nicholas of Lyra (on 22:1). For this passage it also explains the distinction between Passover, the first night of the festival, and the whole seven-day period of the festival, omitted here by Luke and by Erasmus. Cf Fitzmyer AB Luke 1369 and the discussions cited there.

3 For 'true Israelites,' cf the definition of 'Jew' as 'confessor' given by Jerome *De nominibus Hebraicis* CCL 72 67, 136, 152, 155, 157. Cf the paraphrase on John 4:42 CWE 46 61 with n62.

4 Cf the 'unleavened bread of sincerity and truth' in 1 Cor 5:8, a passage quoted by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 592C–593A, followed by the *Gloss* (on 22:1); he interprets the Passover events as types of Christ's sacrifice of himself and deliverance of his followers from Egyptian slavery.

from then on he would be on the lookout for his own safety. Meanwhile they were unmindful of how often he had escaped the grasp of a raving crowd unharmed. They were also offended by the timing, hardly suitable for carrying the business through, because of the festival occasion and the throngs of people.[5]

But an opportunity that unexpectedly presented itself from another direction, joined with their own unholy intention, thrust aside their scruple about the festival day. For Satan, who had tested Jesus earlier in person, now through his underlings and instruments pursuing that same Jesus, had seized the heart of Judas Iscariot, who was one of the chosen twelve whom Jesus had called apostles. Only the lust for the money he had handled drove Judas to such an extreme of madness that of his own free will he went to the chief priests and magistrates (for the priests also had an armed troop, though not for this purpose), negotiating a deal with them about betraying Jesus into their hands.[6] For he knew that they were discussing this. And indeed, no servant is better suited to betraying Jesus than one who in name and by claim is Jesus' intimate associate but in the disposition of his mind is an enemy. Judas did not think ill of the Lord, and had not been offended by him that he should have had reason to wish him harm, but the plague of greed possessed his heart. The priests were glad that an actor had been provided to take the leading role in this play.[7] They liked Judas' plan and

* * * * *

5 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 593B, followed by the *Gloss* (on 22:2), says that the priests feared the people not because they anticipated an uprising but because they wished to avoid Jesus' being snatched from their hands by help from the people. For their reluctance to carry out their plot during the festival cf Matt 26:5, Mark 14:2.

6 Judas' lust for money (a theme of Matt 26:14–16 and John 12:4–6, passages cited here by Nicholas of Lyra), the madness of his action, his free choice to betray Jesus, his long association with Jesus, and the small price he proposed (as below in the paraphrase) all feature in Chrysostom's exposition of this episode in *Hom in Matthaeum* 80 (81) PG 58 727. Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1064A suggests that the στρατηγοί 'commanders, military officers' are the temple guard. Erasmus himself, in the annotation *et magistratibus* (on 22:4) says that στρατηγοί means the temple guards referred to elsewhere (that is, at 22:52); he follows that view here.

7 'Actor' is *histrio*; 'play,' *fabula*; 'play the leading role,' *primas partes agere*. Erasmus' vocabulary comes directly from his familiarity with classical Latin comedy and his use of drama as an interpretive schema. Cf the *Purgatio* ASD IX-1 452 and Manfred Hoffmann *Rhetoric and Theology: The Hermeneutics of Erasmus* (Toronto 1994) 250–1 (n96). This theoretical mode caused Erasmus trouble with his more literal-minded Catholic critics; cf Erika Rummel *Erasmus and*

they agreed to his price, which he had set at a quite reasonable rate, so that the actuality would correspond to the prophecy.[8] They promised the money and he promised the work. Meanwhile he looked for an opportunity to hand Jesus over to them away from the crowd, as they wanted, so no uproar would arise from his supporters.[9] And he did know all the Lord's private retreats.

But now the day of Unleavened Bread, most holy to the Jews, had come, in which according to the Law's direction the lamb was to be killed that, as I said, the Jews call Phase from the passing over. But the Lord Jesus was the Phase, the most pure lamb, who would be sacrificed for the salvation of the world according to the everlasting purpose of the Father.[10] He wanted to fix the memory of his death deeply in the hearts of his followers and teach them that he suffered all this knowingly and willingly. So at the last meal he would have with them Jesus chose to enact in mystic symbols and in their presence the thing that he would accomplish the next day on the cross, well aware how they would be thrown into confusion by his death. So he took the opportunity while their hearts were still capable of being instructed. He gave this task to the two disciples he particularly loved, Peter and John. 'Go,' he said, 'and prepare us the paschal lamb, so we may eat it together.' You note the beginning of the church and the end of the synagogue.

Since the Lord had no fixed dwelling of his own, though he was creator and Lord of all, the disciples asked where he wanted his paschal meal prepared. Now the disciples were so much guests and strangers in the city that they scarcely knew any one household well. Indeed so ought Christ's true disciples to be in this world.[11] But Jesus, in order to show them that

* * * * *

His Catholic Critics II: 1523–1536 (Nieuwkoop 1989) 39 and 52. Cf chapter 15 n34 and chapter 20 n42 above.

8 Zech 11:12, Matt 26:15, 27:3–9

9 'Crowd' is *turba*; 'uproar,' *tumultus*. The annotation *sine turbis* (on 22:6) said that the Latin *turba*, like the Greek word it translates, can mean both 'crowd' and 'uproar,' and that the latter is implied here. The paraphrase accommodates the annotation and the familiar Vulgate text.

10 The definition of Phase as 'passing over' is given in treatments of this passage by Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 904B, Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1064C, and Hugh of St Cher (on 22:7) 258V. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 594A quotes 1 Cor 5:7 'Christ our paschal lamb [*pascha*] is sacrificed for us' in discussing this passage and adds that the killing of Christ was ordained by the Father's purpose and decree.

11 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 594B points out the homeless state of Christ the Lord of all but recommends its imitation to those whose attention is spent on elaborate building projects.

nothing of what was soon to be was unknown to him, said to them, 'Well, when you enter the city someone carrying a water jar full of water will meet you. Follow him as far as the house he will enter. There you will say to the householder, "The teacher bade us say to you, in his words, 'Where is there an upper room where I may eat the paschal lamb with my disciples?"' He will recognize the title "teacher," as he recognized the word "Lord" when you untied the donkey.[12] He will promptly show you a large upper room already set up for a future dinner party. Prepare the Passover for me there.'

– Now consider that, my dear Theophilus. The host who provides the upper room is unknown, and a water-carrier is the guide to this house in which Christ celebrates the Passover. For entry into the church is through baptism and sacred teaching: the living water of the gospel word cleanses, the water of the sacrament also cleanses. The householder does not have a name, since the church of Christ is everywhere, having arisen originally from unnoticed beginnings but spreading itself day by day more widely throughout the whole world.[13] –

Since faith is the beginning of all salvation, the disciples trusted the Lord and obeyed him. They went into the city, they found the water-carrier, they followed where he went. They reported to the householder what they had been bidden. He showed them a large upper room. Indeed, that which is to be capable of containing all the nations of the world needs to be ample.

* * * * *

12 Apparently only Chrysostom among Erasmus' usual sources on this episode remarks on any similarity between procuring the donkey for the entry into Jerusalem (19:30–4; Matt 21:1–3) and arranging for a room in which to celebrate the Passover; see *Hom in Matthaeum* 81 (82) PG 59 728–31 (on Matt 26:18). But Chrysostom's point is the similarity in Jesus' instructions; he does not say the householder in the two episodes is the same person. Nicholas of Lyra (on 22:11) says that the householder 'is thought to have been a disciple of Christ and therefore saw to the place, the lamb, and the other necessities' for the Passover; he says nothing of the donkey.

13 Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1907C suggests that the water is (among many other possibilities) the water of baptism, as does Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 904C. But the triple allegorical interpretation Erasmus uses here seems to owe most to Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 594C–D, who says that this episode marks the true Passover when the baptism of life-giving water that takes away sins will be consecrated, while the water-carrier, symbolizing the herald of grace, and the householder are both unnamed because they symbolize that anyone at all may enter the house of the church. The *Gloss* (on 22:10) and Hugh of St Cher (*mystice* on 22:11) 258v include modifications of this interpretation. For connections made between water and the gospel word, cf eg the paraphrases on John 7:37–9 and 9:7 CWE 46 100–1 and 123.

For the synagogue of the Jews is narrow. And those who want to eat heavenly food ought to be removed far from earthly things. So the disciples prepared the meal here, carrying out, of course, the duty of shepherds.[14]

Now when it was time for dinner, Jesus came there and took his place at table with the twelve chosen disciples, because the others were not yet capable of such an abstruse mystery, which he wanted communicated later through his apostles to those who would then be initiates in the gospel sacraments. When they were at table and the food and drink were set before them, the Lord wanted to fix deeply in the minds of his followers that he was going to suffer the punishment of the cross out of no compulsion but out of love for the redemption of the human race. He said to them, 'I have longed with a great longing to eat this Passover lamb with you before my death. I am glad that the time for it is here, because I thirst for the salvation of humankind.[15] For I tell you, from now on I shall not eat the Passover with you according to the Law's direction. But another more perfect Passover according to the Spirit will be completed in the kingdom of God. The lamb that is ceremonially slaughtered every year by the Jews has been a figure

* * * * *

14 As distributors of food, as eg in the paraphrases on 9:13, Matt 14:19 LB VII 85B, or John 6:11–12 CWE 46 77

15 Luke's account of the Passover meal at which the Christian Eucharist was instituted is notoriously different from the parallel accounts in Matthew and Mark, not to say John, and presents both textual and interpretive difficulties. See the discussion in Fitzmyer AB Luke on 22:15–20, 1385–1403. One of the most striking differences between this and the other accounts is the mention of two cups, one before the breaking of the bread (verse 17) and one after (verse 20). Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 595A–597B, followed by the *Gloss* (on 22:15–20), divides the whole meal into two parts: first, the eating of the paschal lamb and drinking of the paschal cup in the OT tradition (the lamb is not specified but certainly implied in the Gospel text's 'eat this Passover,' 22:15), which are carnal or corporeal figures of the offering of Jesus' own self; and second, the subsequent spiritual Passover or Eucharist that Jesus institutes with bread and the second cup. In the paraphrase Erasmus adopts both this division between OT types and NT fulfilments and the contrasts between flesh and spirit; he marks a strong separation in the last sentence of this paragraph, the conclusion of the paraphrase on verse 18.
For Erasmus' views on the theology of the Eucharist, see eg chapter 24, 271–2 and n142 below; also the paraphrases on John 6, especially 6:51 CWE 46 86 with n69, and Acts 2:42 CWE 50 24–5 with nn115 and 118, and the references cited in those places. The Eucharist is mentioned in passing or discussed at some length in other of his works as well; see eg the *Enchiridion* CWE 66 70–1, the indexes to the *Colloquies* CWE 39–40, the index to CWE 63 *Expositions of the Psalms*, and the *Detectio praestigiarum* LB X 1557–72.

of my death. Now the truth is at hand and the shadow will cease; from now on you will celebrate for me a spiritual and potent Passover,[16] and eating it will make you immortal.' Then when each one had tasted the flesh of the lamb, Jesus took a cup, gave thanks to the Father, and having poured an offering,[17] held out the cup and said to his disciples, 'Take this and divide it among you. I tell you, from now on I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine according to the need of the flesh, but soon the kingdom of God will be here. All these fleshly things that the Law has contained will be revealed in their spiritual meaning. The end of the figures of the Law is here and now.'[18]

With this our Lord Jesus, who was about to consecrate in a mystic symbol a new covenant[19] for his followers, took bread, and having given thanks to the Father, broke it in his hands and gave it to the disciples, saying, 'This is my body, which is given over to death for you. My death will not be repeated. For a single victim suffices for the sins of all ages.[20] But you will often renew for yourselves the memory of this my love for you, doing among yourselves what you now see being done by me. For this will be the holiest sign of the pact made between us.' Then when the meal was finished, he took the cup also, and holding it out to them said, 'This is the new covenant, not consecrated by blood of calf or goat but by my blood, which is shed to save you.[21] You have the ultimate proof and pledge of my love for you.

* * * * *

16 'Passover' here is *phase*, though Erasmus had used *pascha* in the preceding sentences; the Gospel has *pascha* in verse 15. Cf n2 above.

17 *libato . . . calice.* Erasmus introduces the Roman and Jewish gesture of pouring a drink offering as part of a prayer. The terms *libare* and *libatio*, classical Latin for the practice in ancient Roman religion, are also found in the Vulgate OT, eg at Exod 29:40, Numbers 28, 2 Sam 23:16, and Joel 1:9 and 13.

18 See eg Heb 8:5, 9:23–10:18 for the shadows or types found in the OT and their passing away. Bede's explication of this entire episode, *In Lucam expos* PL 92 595A, emphasizes the figurative nature of OT ritual and history and their supersession by the new dispensation, as well as Jesus' willingness to be sacrificed. Echoes are found in Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1068B–1069B, the marginal and interlinear *Gloss* (on 22:17–20) and Hugh of St Cher (on 22:17–20) 259r–v.

19 *testamentum*, from verse 20 of the Gospel text and the synoptic parallels

20 Cf eg Heb 9:26 and 10:10, 1 Pet 3:18. The Gospel text says only 'for you,' ie those present at the meal; cf Fitzmyer AB Luke 1393 and 1402.

21 Cf Heb 9:12, 13, and 19. 'By my blood' (*meo sanguine*) is Erasmus' alteration, following the annotation *in meo sanguine* (on 22:20), of the Vulgate's 'in my blood'; the annotation commends the elegant explication of the parallelism drawn by the Epistle to the Hebrews between the blood *by* which the old

'Now love should have been mutual, yet there is one here at the table with you who is going to betray me to those who seek my death. And such things are not happening by chance; it has been determined by the divine purpose, it has been predicted by the prophets, that by this course of events the Son of Man would redeem the human race. Indeed, the betrayer serves the general welfare. But since he does it with unholy intent, what will bring salvation to others will result in his own destruction.[22] God's decree does not drag him to his ungodly deed; he is led to it by his own evil lust.'

That remark of Jesus' greatly disturbed the hearts of them all, and they began to ask each other who was the one Jesus had spoken of. No one had a guilty conscience, except only Judas Iscariot; even so, no one dared trust himself. For Jesus did not betray his betrayer, but he did often sting his conscience so he would repent. And he knew that the man would persist in his insanity regardless; he was teaching us to use the greatest gentleness towards sinners, for it cannot be certain whether they might not return to their senses at some point.[23]

Since during the meal the Lord had made mention of the kingdom of God, there again arose among the disciples, still weak and in part smacking of the flesh, a dispute as to who would have first place in the kingdom of God after the Lord's death. For in holding out the bread and the cup he appeared to treat them all equally, saying, 'Divide it among you.' Although Jesus had elsewhere too recalled them from this tendency, now on the point of death he repeated and impressed it on them, saying, 'Do not think that in the kingdom of heaven there is anything like what you see in worldly kingdoms. It is a far different kind of kingdom, and it consists in good deeds, not violence; it is gained and held by spiritual resources, not force; it is spread by persuasion, not by com-

* * * * *

covenant was confirmed and his own blood *by* which Christ declares the new covenant. Following his correction in the annotation *effundetur* (on 22:20), Erasmus uses a present-tense verb instead of a future tense, to represent the Greek present participle.

22 Cf above, the opening paragraph of chapter 17 of the *Paraphrase*, for the idea that Judas' betrayal at once procures a general good and his own destruction.

23 Several of the amplifications in this paragraph (ie that Jesus offers Judas a chance to repent, that he deliberately does not name his betrayer, and that the other disciples, trusting their teacher more than their frail selves, each feared that he would be the betrayer) are found in Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 597C–598A, who is followed by the interlinear and marginal *Gloss* (on 22:21–3) and Hugh of St Cher (on 22:21–3) 260r. Hugh and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1069D also mention Jesus' intention to give us a model for perseverance even with unrepentant sinners.

pulsion. The princes of this world indeed wield dominion over those over whom they have the authority of government; for they do not persuade their subjects to love honourable things, they deter them from evil deeds by fear of punishment, and they require respect from their subjects even if they do not earn it. Why, the closer they come to tyranny the more they require respect from their subjects; and for a time the people show them respect with splendid titles. They are called princes, fathers of their country, saviours, consuls, because they oppress their inferiors with their power.[24]

'Such indeed is the kingdom of the gentiles; but among you, whom I am shaping and instructing for the gospel kingdom, there will be a far different system. The greater anyone is among you, the less will he claim for himself of violent power or glory. And he will not look to oppress his inferiors with his own endowments, which he received from God, but to do good and provide aid with them. Nor will he claim credit for himself but assign it entirely to God – not that there is not going to be an order of rank in this kingdom, but he who is chosen for primacy, to be a guide to godliness for others, will so much serve everyone's best interests that he will appear to be a servant rather than a prince.[25] The heart ever ready to

* * * * *

24 'Fathers of their country' (*patres patriae*) and 'saviours' (*servatores*) are common titles in the idiom of ancient Roman politics and history. They were often awarded to generals, statesmen, and emperors by the senate or populace for achievements which, when the political climate changed, could equally well be viewed as oppressive. For example, the Roman general Flamininus was hailed as saviour of Greece in 194 BC (Livy 34.50.9). Cicero was called father of his country for suppressing the conspiracy of Catiline but later on exiled for violating Catiline's civic rights, a reversal of fortune referred to in many places and conveniently summarized in Plutarch *Life of Cicero*. 'Consuls' among this list of possible splendid titles is justified not only by its designation of the highest elected officials in the ancient Roman system of government, as is appropriate to the dramatic date of the Gospel, but also by its use for various royal, diplomatic, papal, and local officials and grandees during the Middle Ages and Renaissance; see J.F. Niermeyer *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minor* (Leiden 1976), R.E. Latham *Revised Medieval Latin Word-list from British and Irish Sources* (London 1965), and René Hoven *Lexique de la prose latine de la Renaissance* (Leiden 1994) under *consul*.

25 The annotation *sicut minor* (on 22:26) had observed that the Greek and Latin texts imply a contrast of age, 'older' and 'younger,' in the first part of verse 26, but that the point is the relative degrees of respect rather than age as such. The paraphrase leaves no room for ambiguity. A second annotation on the same verse, *et qui praecessor est*, says that the Vulgate *praecessor* 'one who goes before' is not as good a choice to translate ὁ ἡγούμενος 'leader' as *dux* 'guide,' 'commander' or *rector* 'leader'; the paraphrase speaks of 'primacy' and 'guide.'

do good for all will not court approval but will earn it; not arrogance or scornfulness but uprightness of life will assure authority.

'Do not then disdain to manifest to each other the same self-restraint I have offered to you, though by right I could have claimed dominion for myself. For consider: which seems greater, the one who serves the table or the one who has a place at table? Is it not the one who has a place at table? Not because anyone at the table is actually greater; in fact, one who welcomes others to a banquet is greater precisely because he is doing good towards many. Yet for courtesy's sake, when the others he has invited are at table, he goes back and forth, anxious that no one lack anything at the banquet; and the anxiousness of the one looks to the enjoyment of all.[26] Have I not conducted myself in this way among you? Have I not lived with you as if I were the servant of you all, offering service from what is mine to give, and myself alone anxious for all? How much more ought you to be removed from all tyranny and self-seeking, for you are equal in rank, you offer service from what is mine, you have a common master! You have been given that holiest symbol of gospel harmony so that you may embrace each other with the love with which I have embraced you.

'Yet harmony cannot survive where self-seeking is king. Respect, then, must be earned, not claimed. For the princes of this world, though they carry out their service rightly, will still have no reward before God, because they force respect from their subjects. But you, indifferent to reward, are to think only of duty. It will be my task to see to your honour. If you are imitators of my lowliness you will also be partners of my glory. If you are companions in afflictions you will be companions in immortality. And thus far you have stayed by me in my afflictions, by which the heavenly Father wanted my obedience to be tried and tested. Not lowliness, not poverty, not the struggles of making a living, not people's carping criticisms, not the Pharisees' plots, not the threats of the powerful have drawn you away from my fellowship, though some have deserted and others have not dared to proclaim themselves my disciples.[27]

* * * * *

26 Ecclus 32:1–2 (1–3 Vulg), cited by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 598C–D. Cf also 12:37 and the paraphrase on it above; Hugh of St Cher (on 22:27) 260v alludes to the same verse. There may also be some covert allusion to the footwashing episode in John 13, mentioned in connection with this passage by Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 913A, the *Gloss* (on 22:27), and Nicholas of Lyra (on 22:27). The last sentence of this paragraph echoes John 13:34 and 15:12.

27 For desertion by disciples cf John 6:66; for reluctance to admit to discipleship cf John 3:1–2, 7:50, 19:39 (Nicodemus).

'But if you are steadfast in this intention and do not disdain to imitate my lowliness here and now so that you may do more good to all, I in turn will see to it that someday you are sharers in the glory of my kingdom. For my Father wished this to be the way to the heavenly kingdom. I have opened the way to you thus far, and I shall open it by my death. Through lowliness he will carry me on to the glory of the kingdom, through passing afflictions to eternal joys. The Father has prepared a kingdom for me because here and now according to his will I am taking the part of a servant, not a master. I too, when I have been carried on to the honour of the kingdom, shall prepare[28] a partnership in the kingdom for you who follow in my footsteps, so that you who have not sought honour here but have conducted yourselves as servants of all, diligently dispensing the gospel teaching, may take your places at my table in my kingdom no longer as servants but as honoured sons of God.[29] And you, who for my sake are now regarded among the Jews as completely despicable, will then sit as princes on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. For the baseness of those who now appear to have the pinnacle of power in their grasp will then be made manifest, and likewise the exalted station of you who now seem to be the dregs of the world.'[30]

Jesus said these things in symbolic language, adjusting his words to the unschooled state of his disciples, a state which he allowed to continue in them for a long time, partly so that he could more effectively take away the human passions in us, passions by which the disciples were then bound, and partly so that we may endure the weakness of others with great gentleness until they advance to better things. It remained to arm the hearts of his disciples against the threatening gale and to take away their self-confidence. For a storm of affliction flattens no one faster than those who trust in their own powers. But precisely those who put no trust in their own, that is, in human, resources and rely entirely on heavenly defence are firm against all the tumults of this world. And so he turned the conversation to Peter, to instruct and chasten everyone through him.[31] For he knew that this one

* * * * *

28 Here and in the preceding sentence Erasmus substitutes *parare* 'prepare' from John 14:2–3 Vulg for *disponere* in 22:29 Vulg (corresponding to different words in the two Greek texts).

29 Cf Rom 8:15–17 and Galatians 4, especially verse 7.

30 Cf Paul's description of the apostles in 1 Cor 4:13 as *purgamenta mundi* and *omnium peripsema*. Erasmus here says *reiectamenta mundi*; in his NT revision he had translated the words in 1 Cor as *excrementa mundi* and *omnium reiectamentum* LB VI 676A.

31 The need for reliance on heavenly resources, not one's own, is marked as the point of this address to Peter by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 600B and echoed

had quicker feelings than the others and a great deal of self-confidence, a well-meaning disposition to be sure, but a human one. For he had not yet received the bestower of complete virtue, the Holy Spirit.[32]

So he said, 'Simon, Simon, look: Satan has sought you [all] eagerly, to winnow and sieve you like wheat, to scatter you if he can. And he would have done it, if you had been left to your own weakness. But I have prayed to the Father for you, Peter, that though your faith may waver, yet it will not fail. It has been decided to make you the example of this, since you have a great deal of confidence in yourself, so that when you return to yourself after your fall, by your example you may strengthen your brothers who fall victim to the same weakness.[33] Thus everyone will understand that no one in his own strength is a match for the wickedness of Satan unless he is shored up by my defence.' When he heard this, still trusting in his own strength, Peter said, 'Lord, what abandonment or betrayal are you talking about? No, you will find me steadfast and invincible in faith. And as I have not deserted you till now, so I will never desert you from now on; I am ready to face the worst mortal danger with you, whether we must go to prison or even to death.' This statement, proceeding indeed from a pious and honest heart but one not yet sufficiently known to itself, the Lord promptly checked with a reply of the following kind: 'What are you saying, Peter? You will go with me to prison and even to death? No, but I predict for you something else: what will happen is that you will deny me three times, and swear you do not know me, tonight before the cock crows twice.[34] So great will the storm of affliction be.'

* * * * *

by the *Gloss* (on 22:31), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1076B, and Hugh of St Cher (on 22:31) 261r. The three Latin exegetes also mention the coming 'storm' (*procella*) of trials, an image Erasmus uses here (*tempestas* 'gale' and *afflictionum procella* 'storm of afflictions') and in the paraphrases on verses 34, 36, and 40 below.

32 Peter has an often-repeated reputation for hotheadedness, based on a passionate temperament and overconfidence in himself. Cf the paraphrases on John 13:9, 36–8, 18:10, and 21:7–17 CWE 46 161, 166, 199–200, 222–4 and the notes there. Similar observations are made by eg Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 82 (83) PG 58 741–2 (on Matt 26:33–4), Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 600D, Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1073C–1076A, Hugh of St Cher (on 22:31) 261r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 22:33).

33 Erasmus uses the Latin you-plural and you-singular forms as they are used in the Gospel text. The 'you's' of the first two sentences in this paragraph are plural, addressed to all the disciples ('all' in the text is a translator's insertion); the next two sentences address only Peter.

34 Erasmus amplifies Jesus' comment in 22:34 with two points: at Matt 26:34 and Mark 14:30 Jesus says to Peter, 'You will deny me,' whereas in Luke he says,

After he had taken their self-confidence from them he again impressed on them what he had often taught, that they were not to forearm themselves with provisions against necessity or equip themselves with human defences against the violence of evil men, because the servant of the heavenly gospel ought to be free from the base cares of this life and outfitted against all assaults of the ungodly with no other weapons than the sword of the Spirit, which is the divine word.[35] 'When I sent you as an experiment,' he said, 'to preach among the Jews that the kingdom of God is at hand, you were outfitted with no provisions, to the extent of not even having a pouch for holding money or a sack for carrying food or shoes to protect your feet. Did you run short of anything?' They replied, 'Nothing.'

Then, to tear every desire for vengeance completely out of their heart, Jesus deceived them for the time being by the obscurity of his words, but he allowed them to be mistaken so that he might more definitely and effectively take away all inclination to revenge. For he knew that they would be kindled to eagerness to defend him when they saw their Lord, whom they loved very passionately but still with human feeling, attacked by armed guards in so much uproar. If he had not chastened that feeling quite plainly, we would have thought that we were permitted to defend ourselves by arms against the violence of ungodly men, and to repel force with force. As it is, since Peter was reproved because he drew his sword against ungodly and criminal men on behalf of his entirely innocent Lord, what reason can there be from now on for any Christian to repel injury with injury?[36]

* * * * *

'You will deny that you know me.' It is only Mark at 14:30 who says the cock will crow twice. The number of times the cock will crow is a famous, and perhaps insignificant, problem for students of the Gospel narratives; see eg Fitzmyer AB Luke 1426–7, Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 82 (83) PG 58 759 (on Matt 26:74), Hugh of St Cher (on 22:34) 261r. Erasmus also includes 'twice' in his paraphrase on Matthew 26:34 and 74 (cf 26:70). In the *1527* annotation *bis vocem dederit* (on Mark 14:30) he explains that the ancients divided the night into several parts, including a predawn cockcrow followed by a period of general silence and then the cockcrow marking morning twilight; this latter is in his view the cockcrow meant by Jesus. Cf the paraphrase on verse 60 and n62 below.

35 Cf Eph 6:17, which in the Vulgate says *verbum* for 'word.' Erasmus has *sermo* here, his preference in speaking of Christ as the Divine Word. See his *Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo'* LB IX, the paraphrase on John 1:1 CWE 46 15–18, and the Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited in this and other CWE volumes of the *Paraphrases* under *sermo*.

36 This paraphrase on 22:36 was criticized by Béda and the Paris theologians as outlawing every use of force. Erasmus' replies in the *Supputatio* LB IX 616A–617C and *Declarationes* LB IX 840D–843B emphasized that the Gospel passage

Indeed the Lord said, 'You went to the first preaching of the gospel unencumbered and equipped with no provisions, and yet, with my protection, you ran short of nothing; that was enough for you because no severe storm was threatening. From now on your heart must be prepared for harsher things. For the more savage the storm of persecution will be, the more must you be unencumbered by earthly impediments. Now a great war threatens, and a sword is needed. Therefore, if anyone happens to have a money-pouch or a food-sack, let him get rid of it to buy a sword.[37] But if these things, which can be discarded and which you have done without easily enough, are lacking, let him sell his shirt and buy a sword. One must come to this war quite unencumbered, and equipped with nothing else but a sword. The issue will come to desperate straits. Not only will they lay vio-

* * * * *

and the paraphrase speak out against vengeance and the spread of the church by force of arms, as well as noting that the views attributed to the evangelist Luke in his historical context should not be confused with Erasmus' views about his own times. Cf the next note and chapter 21 n16 above.

37 Erasmus interprets Jesus' words here in accordance with his pacifism, well known to his readers before the publication of the *Paraphrases* from such works as the *Panegyricus*, the *Moria*, the *Institutio principis christiani*, the *Querela pacis* (all in CWE 27), and *Adagia* IV i 1: *Dulce bellum inexpertis* 'War is sweet to those who have not tried it.' Cf the paraphrase on John 18:10–11 CWE 46 200. He also understands Jesus' admonition 'But now, let him who has a purse take it, and likewise a bag. And let him who has no sword sell his mantle and buy one' (verse 36) to mean that the purse and bag, as well as the mantle, or shirt, should be sold to buy a sword, that is, the sword of the Spirit, as he has said just above. Cf the preceding note. In fact, the Greek and Latin verbs for 'take' in the verse, αἴρειν and *tollere*, do allow the meaning 'take away,' 'remove.' In the annotation *sed nunc qui habet sacculum* (on 22:36), originally a long one and much expanded in 1519 and 1522 (and thereafter), Erasmus defended his interpretation as rhetorically and theologically consistent with Jesus' preaching and life. He launched an attack upon those who argue that this passage (and Peter's blow at one of the men who came to arrest Jesus, verses 49–51) justifies the church's use of military force. His chief targets were the literal interpretations of Hugh of St Cher and Nicholas of Lyra; see the passages cited in n39 below. Other views similar to theirs, that Jesus is now moderating his instructions for preachers, not radicalizing them, are offered also by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 601A–B, the *Gloss* (on 22:35), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1076D–1077C, and the allegorical interpretations of Hugh and Nicholas. Erasmus had made an earlier attack on Nicholas' literal interpretation of this passage in a 1514 addition to the *Moria*; cf CWE 27 144–6 and C.H. Miller's commentary to his translation, *Desiderius Erasmus: The Praise of Folly* (New Haven 1979) 123–6. Erasmus' view is not included among the four interpretations discussed by Fitzmyer AB Luke 1431–2.

lent hands on me but what Isaiah once foretold of me also has to be fulfilled: "And he was reckoned with the transgressors." If it is a serious matter to be killed, how much more serious to suffer shameful punishment among criminals? And this too awaits the Son of Man. The time is now at hand for the accomplishment of all that the prophets have foretold about me.'

Since the apostles did not understand these words and supposed that the Lord had advised them to have a sword ready to repulse the violence that threatened, they simple-mindedly replied, 'Lord, look, here are two swords already' – thinking that swords would be needed in any case and fearing only that two swords would not be enough for the fight. They displayed a disposition to fight for the Lord, who they knew could supply from his own store whatever might be lacking in their resources, just as before he had increased the five loaves and two fish so that they were enough for many thousands of people.[38] Jesus left his disciples in this very dull-witted state for the time being, so that (as I said) their weakness might educate us to complete forbearance. And so he said, 'It is enough.' They took his remark to mean that the first battle could be handled with the two swords they then had ready, though Christ meant the spiritual battle against the world and Satan, in which victory attaches to a heart unencumbered by all earthly desires and armed only with the sword of the heavenly teaching. To enable you to understand the two swords extended by the one Spirit, the teaching consists of the inviolable Scripture of Old and New Testament.[39]

But since soldiers who are about to go into battle customarily refresh their bodies and rouse their spirits for the coming conflict with the enemy, the Lord wanted to show his followers what in particular would strengthen them against such confrontations whenever they threatened. So he left Jerusalem and as was his practice went to Mt Olivet, accompanied by his disciples.[40] When they reached the secluded spot where he was accustomed

* * * * *

38 Luke 9:12–17

39 For the sword of the Spirit, cf Eph 6:17 and n35 above. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1909D–1910A, the *Gloss* (*mystice* on 22:36 and 38), Hugh of St Cher (on 22:36–8) 261V, and Nicholas of Lyra (*moraliter* on 22:36) all agree that the sword of the Spirit is the word of God and that the two swords are the two Testaments, Old and New. This interpretation is at least as old as Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.14.3.

40 'Olivet' as in Matt 26:30 Vulg; Luke has 'of Olives.' The comparison with soldiers before battle, apart from its general appropriateness leading up to the reference to martyrs below, may also owe something to the habit of Livy, who includes almost formulaic statements about Roman generals exhorting their troops before major battles, ending with an order to 'tend to their bodies';

to pray, he said to them, 'So that you can stand up to the storm that threatens, stay awake and pray that if it comes upon you drowsy and unoccupied it does not snare you in your carelessness and get the better of you.'[41]

On saying this, the Lord removed himself about a stone's throw from them, to pray in solitude for them all, as he alone would suffer for all. But just as his death did not benefit the idle, so his praying should be effective only for those who are earnest in praying for themselves also. And to teach us that the heart must be made submissive whenever we prepare to speak with God, he knelt on the ground and prayed to his Father, saying, 'Father, if it is your will, take this cup from me. I feel the nature that I have put on shrinking from death; but let the salvation of humankind prevail here,[42] and let what your immutable will has appointed come to pass, not what the weakness of this body urges.'

The Lord knew what his Father wanted, and he himself desired to drink the cup of death for the salvation of the world, but he took into himself his body's emotional state and was eager to set down for his followers

* * * * *

cf eg Livy 3.60.1, 5.45.1, 25.38.22 and Curtius Rufus 3.8.22. For Jesus' deliberate demonstration of a model for his followers here and in what follows, cf Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1910B, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 921B, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 603A, Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1080C, and Hugh of St Cher (on 22:41–2) 262r.

41 In *1523* the subject of the conditional clause was not 'it' but *tentator* 'the tempter'; it was gone from the editions thereafter.
The Vulgate text of Jesus' admonition in verse 40, *orate ne intretis in tentationem*, can be understood to mean either 'Pray that you do not enter into temptation' or 'Pray, lest you enter into temptation.' The ambiguity does not exist in the Greek, which plainly means the first of these, not the second. Erasmus' annotation *orate ne intretis in tentationem* (on 22:40) noted the plain meaning of the Greek here and in 22:46. The Latin paraphrase contains the same ambiguity – and the Latin reader might pass over it without raising a question – but this English translation follows Erasmus' explanation of the Greek, partly because Erasmus understood the Latin so and partly because the drowsiness of the disciples is at issue in this episode (as in others; cf eg 9:32 and the paraphrase on John 14:31 CWE 46 175).
The vivid image of being trapped like a rabbit or bird (*illaqueat* 'snare') suggests that Erasmus has in mind Jerome's comment on the temptation in his discussion of the same episode, *Comm in Matthaeum* 26 PL 26 206C, where Jerome mentions the *casses*, *retia*, and *plagae* of temptation, all words for kinds of hunting nets. The language is repeated by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 602B–C and in shortened form by the *Gloss* (on 22:40).

42 The question mark that ends this clause in LB is apparently a mistake for the colon (represented here by the comma) in the lifetime editions.

a form of prayer. This prayer indeed would suit a martyr at the time of execution excellently: 'Your will, not mine, be done, whether you wish me to live or to die.'[43] What is more, Christ took this trembling of our nature into himself in order to take it away from his followers. But to teach us that after we have entirely surrendered ourselves to God's will, whether for life or for death, then heavenly help will be with us from the Lord, an angel from heaven appeared to him and strengthened him. As for our sake he was shaken at the approach of death, so for our sake he was strengthened through an angel. Then an intense anguish[44] seized him, which is a common occurrence with those mentally looking death in the face. Indeed, this feeling is not infrequently more troubling than death itself. And for our sake Jesus, who for our sake did not refuse the tree, did not disdain to accept this torment,[45] teaching us at the same time to what refuge we must flee when that shuddering takes hold of our weakness. For face down on the ground he prayed more passionately.[46] From just this act hangs the whole hope of our victory. And then, so that we would be more steadfast under punishment, such great anguish seized Christ that bloody drops ran down into the earth from his whole body.[47]

* * * * *

43 The martyr is brought forward as an example in discussion of this prayer by Jerome, followed by Bede, in the passages cited in n41 above. Martyrdom also figures largely in Erasmus *De taedio Iesu*; cf n47 below and CWE 70 44–9.

44 'Anguish' is *angor* (here and below). The annotation *et factus in agonia* (on 22:43–4) took issue with the Vulgate *agonia* as not being a Latin word at all; the Greek ἀγών, of which it is a derivative, means 'contest,' 'danger,' or 'struggle,' Erasmus said, so *agonia* ought to mean a human emotional response in the face of crisis but, he implies, it would be unintelligible to the Greekless reader. In his revised Latin text of the verse from *1519* onwards and here in the *Paraphrase* he preferred the completely Latin *angor*; see note 980 to his annotation on the verse in ASD VI-5 595.

45 'Tree' and 'torment' translate Erasmus' punning *crux* 'cross' and *cruciatus* 'torment,' 'torture.'

46 'Face down' is not in the text of Luke but comes from Matt 26:39.

47 The status of verses 43 and 44 in the text of Luke 22 is questionable; see on the verses Fitzmyer AB Luke and the apparatus to the Nestle-Aland Greek text. Erasmus himself in the *1527* and *1535* annotation *guttae sanguinis decurrentis in terram* (on 22:44) reports that both Jerome and Hilary say that in many Greek and Latin manuscripts there is no mention made of either the bloody sweat or the comforting angel; he himself thinks that deletions may have been made in the manuscripts by those who were reluctant to attribute to Christ such marks of human weakness.

Jesus' agony in the garden offered the occasion for Erasmus' first published foray into biblical interpretation. In 1499 in Oxford he and John Colet had a

When he stood up from his prayer, he went back to his disciples and found them asleep from grief. It was not drunkenness but the weakness of nature: their troubling sadness of heart had induced sleep.[48] One who wants to come out victorious in such a struggle must fight against this weakness with strength of spirit. So Jesus scolded his followers and roused them to pray again: 'Why are you asleep now, in the face of such danger?' he said. 'Rise and pray that the growing storm not crush you while you drowse, for the time is now at hand.'[49]

Our Lord Jesus had not yet finished these words when a crowd of wicked soldiers appeared, sent by the even more wicked priests and Pharisees to arrest Jesus.[50] What is more, Judas, a little while ago the follower and table companion of Christ, now the leader of the godless band, preceded them at some distance, having given them a sign ahead of time (this is what is usually done in war),[51] that the one to whom he gave a kiss was

* * * * *

discussion about the nature of Jesus' suffering there, whether it was only dread from foreseeing the suffering of his killers (so Colet, following the tradition of the church Fathers, chiefly the Latin ones) or was also a human dread of his own imminent death (so Erasmus, in line with more recent scholastic tradition and Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 83 (84) PG 58 745 (on Matt 26:36–45) and Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 920A–924C, though Erasmus would not in 1499 have read these in Greek). The disagreement resulted in an exchange of letters, Epp 109–111 (cf also Ep 108), and eventually in the publication of Erasmus' *Disputatiuncula de taedio, pavore, tristicia Iesu* (abbreviated *De taedio Iesu*) 'A Short Debate Concerning the Distress, Alarm, and Sorrow of Jesus.' See the translation in CWE 70, James D. Tracy 'Humanists among the Scholastics: Erasmus, More, and Lefèvre d'Étaples on the Humanity of Christ' ERSY 5 (1985) 30–51, and John B. Gleason *John Colet* (Berkeley 1989) chapter 5.

48 That grief, not weariness at the late hour, had caused the disciples to sleep was noted by Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 83 (84) PG 58 747 (on Matt 26:45) and Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 26 PL 26 206B. Erasmus had inserted the same contrasting pair of explanations for their sleep into his paraphrase on the end of John 14 CWE 46 175, but here offers an additional rejected reason why they might be tired; cf Acts 2:13.

49 Cf n41 above. Erasmus' annotation on 22:40, cited there, had said that verse 46 is a restatement of the exhortation of verse 40.

50 Against the text of verse 52 below but agreeing with the versions of Matt 26:47, Mark 14:43, and John 18:3, Erasmus has the arresting crowd sent by, not composed of, chief priests, temple officials, and elders. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 605C–D, followed by the *Gloss* (on 22:52) and Hugh of St Cher (on 22:52) 263v, agree that in fact the chief priests and other leaders were not present but that Luke is crediting them with final responsibility for the arrest.

51 The prearranged sign is not in Luke; cf Matt 26:48, Mark 14:44.

the one they could be sure was Jesus. When he came closer to Jesus, already about to offer him a kiss in the usual way, the Lord in his mildness did not even refuse the traitor's kiss but again stung his conscience so that, moved perhaps by such great gentleness on the Lord's part, he might repent. 'Judas,' he said, 'do you betray the Son of Man with a kiss?' Judas understood that he was not escaping notice; he knew the Lord's innocence; he was invited so often by unheard-of mildness to change his plans – even a stone could have been softened,[52] if Satan had not now occupied his whole breast with the disease of greed.[53] And Judas' ungodliness did indeed bring destruction upon himself alone; but those who by a similar trick nowadays betray the gospel truth to the princes of this world bring a graver destruction and are deserving of greater punishment than unhappy Judas, repenting of his deed too late, exacted from himself.[54]

After the kiss was given the crowd of soldiers ran up to lay hands on Jesus; they wanted to know who Jesus was for no other purpose than to take him prisoner.[55] But happy are those who desire to know the gospel word for the purpose of imitating Jesus! Then the rest of the disciples, seeing violence being readied against the Lord, and their love supplying them with daring, said to the Lord, 'Lord, do you want us to strike them with the sword?' They remembered what he had said about buying a sword, but because they saw unbroken mildness in him, they were not sure whether he would let them use their swords. Yet Peter, who loved him more passionately than the others and who compared to the others had made brave promises, without waiting for the Lord's answer, made an attack with his sword on one of the servants of the chief priest, the one who first tried to lay hands on Jesus, clearly

* * * * *

52 Cf *Adagia* v ii 17: *Lapides flere* 'The stones would weep.' Erasmus cites this adage as a proverbial hyperbole found for instance in Cicero *De Oratore* 1.245. He says that Jesus uses a similar hyperbole now and again, quoting Luke 19:40 and 3:8 (parallel to Matt 3:9; John the Baptist is actually the speaker); in Christ's case, he adds, this is perhaps not hyperbole, in light of divine omnipotence.

53 Jesus' offer to Judas of an opportunity to repent is noted by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1912D and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1084D–1085A. Erasmus had earlier noted Jesus' habit of offering Judas a chance to repent; cf the paraphrase on 22:23 above. Judas' greed, already a theme earlier in this chapter (cf n6 above), is moralized extensively by Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 83 (84) PG 58 748–53 (on Matt 26:48).

54 A moralizing connection between Judas' behaviour at the head of a crowd of Jesus' enemies and the behaviour of bishops is made by Hugh of St Cher (on 22:47) 263r.

55 The actual approach of the soldiers, at a run, is not in Luke; cf Matt 26:50.

reflecting the savagery of his master.[56] But, the Lord's mildness directing the blow, he only cut off the man's right ear. Happy are they whose ear, which till now has heeded godless priests and unspiritual Law, is cut off; and when the ear is restored by Christ it gives heed to the things that make for eternal salvation! The wound was more embarrassing than dangerous, but still incurable, because once cartilage is cut it does not knit together again. Yet when Jesus, for whom no wound is incurable, had scolded the disciple because contrary to gospel mildness and still remembering the old Law he had begun to fight with a sword,[57] he restored Malchus' ear in such a way that no trace of the wound could be seen. For the soldiers and servants were committing very little sin, because their foolishness was in service to the wickedness of the priests, Pharisees, and scribes. Violence ought rather to have been wrought on this latter group, except that it seemed best to God that the gospel victory be rooted in forbearance.

In order to make it plain that he was suffering all this willingly, Jesus turned to those whom the godless priests and scribes had sent and said to them, 'What happened, that now you have left the city by night, armed with swords and clubs, and have run up here as if to attack a violent robber who is resisting arrest? When I was with you in the temple every day, weaponless and in full view of all, no one laid hands on me. Surely you had the same will then as you have now; but you were blocked by the will of him whom no one can resist. For the time had not yet come when I had determined to suffer. But this time is your time, the night-time, and this is the power of darkness, given a free hand by God.' With these words our Lord Jesus put up no struggle but presented himself to be bound.

They arrested him and took him to the house of Caiaphas, who was then chief priest, the worst part of the whole Jewish people.[58] The council of priests, scribes, Pharisees, and leaders of the people, with the rest of the number that served their wickedness out of fear or inclination or mistaken

* * * * *

56 The striker's identity and that of his victim (which appears just below) are not in Luke but in John 18:10; Peter or both Peter and Malchus are named here by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1913B, Augustine *De consensu evangelistarum* 3.5, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 604C, the *Gloss* (on 22:49), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1085B, and Hugh of St Cher (on 22:49) 263r.

57 John 18:11 reports Jesus' rebuke, but there, as in Luke, it is addressed to all the disciples, not to Peter alone; Matt 26:52 has Jesus speaking only to Peter. All three of the Gospels give Jesus' words as a direct quotation; Erasmus has compressed the content to a reported summary.

58 The name Caiaphas is added from Matt 26:57. For his characterization here, cf John 18:14.

judgment, had gathered in Caiaphas' reception hall. Meanwhile the rest of the disciples, dumbstruck with fear, had scattered in various directions. But Peter, though his attempt at fighting had been less than successful, had still not put aside all hope of rescue and was following Jesus at a distance. He even dared to go through the shadows into the high priest's reception hall and to mingle unrecognized with the crowd of household servants. What is more, since a charcoal fire had been lit in the middle of the room because of the late-night chill, Peter joined in and took a seat among the servants sitting around it, and with them warmed himself at the coals.[59]

When a maidservant saw him sitting with his face exposed to the light, she looked more closely[60] at him and recognized him; and so that she would declare herself like her master she immediately cried out in the hearing of the others, 'This one was also with the man who was taken prisoner!' This did not happen by chance; the event suited the divine dispensation, so that Peter's confidence might be more blunted, since earlier he had so grandly promised the Lord that he would go with him even to death. Now he denied his Lord at the words of a mere woman. Terrified at this remark from the woman, Peter shamefully replied, 'Woman, I don't know him.' So Peter got off the hook the first time, but soon the danger was renewed. For one of the menservants again began to realize who he was and said to him, 'You too were one of that group whose leader we arrested.' Again frightened at this remark Peter said, 'Fellow, I am not,' swearing that he did not know Jesus. Again he got off the hook by lying. And meanwhile what the Lord had foretold to him and what he had promised the Lord did not enter his mind.

While this was going on Jesus was being questioned by the godless council, and contrary to the custom in law courts was struck a blow, while Peter watched from a distance to see what the outcome of the business would be. But after the space of about an hour, another one of the men-

* * * * *

59 Erasmus supplements Luke's description of this scene with details from Matthew, who is closely followed, according to Erasmus' understanding of the genesis of the Gospels, by Mark. Some of these are the presence of representatives of the council when Jesus is first delivered to Caiaphas (Matt 26:57; cf Luke 22:66), the flight of the other disciples (Matt 26:56), and identification of those with whom Peter sat as servants (Matt 26:58; cf Luke 22:56). From John 18:18 he borrows the late-night chill to explain the fire.

60 *fixius intuita.* The annotation *et dum fuisset intuita* (on 22:56) had explained that the Vulgate verb *intueri* 'look at' was a weak translation of the Greek, which means rather 'to look at fixedly' or 'without moving one's eyes'; by adding the adverb *fixius* 'more closely' the paraphrase reflects this observation.

servants, a relative of the one whose ear Peter had cut off, looked at Peter and recognized him, and said, 'This man was certainly also with Jesus in the garden.' When Peter denied it he added, 'Even his language makes it plain that what I am saying is true, for he is a Galilean.' At that Peter, completely panic-stricken, began to swear and say he was damned if he even knew what Jesus or what garden or what Galileans the man was talking about. So far had Peter, the future prince of the church, forgotten himself.[61]

Then while Peter was denying, swearing, cursing, and damning himself the cock crowed the second time, the sign that the Lord had given him; and not even so did he return to his senses.[62] There would have been no end to his going astray if the Lord had not turned his eyes through the unholy crowd between them and looked at him. Touched by his Lord's gaze, Peter remembered the words that the Lord had said a short while before: 'Before the cock crows twice tonight you will deny me three times.' And suddenly struck with an intense grief, he betook himself outside and wept bitterly.

The other disciples would have done the same thing that Peter did if a like necessity had befallen them, but in Peter alone Jesus wished to teach us all that no one should trust in himself, that no one should mix in the company of evildoers. It was night, love had grown cold in him, and he was warming himself at the fire of the ungodly.[63] He sat in the midst of

* * * * *

61 Erasmus modifies Luke's narrative to accommodate details from the other Gospels. The division of Peter's triple denial into two parts, divided by one stage of the inquisition of Jesus, reflects the structure of John 18:15–27. John 18:22–3 reports Jesus being struck by a single blow during questioning; the paraphrase on those verses adds Jesus' pointing out the legal impropriety of the act (CWE 46 202). John 18:26 says Peter's third questioner was a relative of Malchus who believed Peter had been in the garden with Jesus. Peter's wanting to see the outcome of the hearing is found in Matt 26:58. Specific mention of Peter's language as betraying his Galilean origin is from Matt 26:73 and is mentioned by Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 26 PL 26 211B–C, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 607B–C, and Hugh of St Cher (on 22:59) 264r. His swearing his denial depends on Matt 26:72 and 74; cf Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1088A, who mentions the Matthew passage.

62 Erasmus has not mentioned a first time; cf n34 above and Mark 14:72. Both Augustine *De consensu evangelistarum* 3.6 and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1088B justify Mark's mention of a second crowing as the most reasonable version.

63 For various aspects of the heat of Peter's passions, cf n32 above. For love growing cold, cf Matt 24:12. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1915B–C and Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 606B–D contrast inner and outer heat and cold tropologically in their discussions of this scene.

the ungodly in the house of the high priest Caiaphas, himself a future high priest but quite unlike that one. What crimes were not perpetrated there? There a conspiracy was formed among the priests, Pharisees, scribes, and elders of the people for the murder of Jesus. From there armed guards were sent out against him; there he was bound, beaten, blindfolded, mocked, and accused. There Peter swore falsely and cursed, a dreadful wrong if its weakness did not excuse it. For he did not sin out of premeditated wickedness, as Judas had, but in confusion of mind. He had not come there to deny but to see the outcome of the trial, not yet sufficiently steadfast to die with Christ; that time had not yet come. So let all those who have fallen into grave wrongdoing pray to our Lord Jesus that he may see fit to turn his eyes towards them, and they will instantly recognize from what and to what they have fallen. Let them remove themselves from evil company and wash away their guilt with tears that bear witness to their change of heart.[64]

Meanwhile the whole night was passed in mockery of Jesus. Indeed, those who had taken Jesus prisoner were mocking him, adding blows to their insults. Moreover, since they had heard that the people revered him as a prophet, they blindfolded him and slapped him in the face, saying, 'Prophesy who struck you,' and with many other jests and insults the godless crowd drunkenly assaulted the wellspring of all glory, so that no one of us would feel indignation if for the sake of the gospel word he is attacked with insults, if he is afflicted with evils by those who serve the purposes of profane priests, of deceiving Pharisees, of foolish princes.

When day dawned, intending now to display the forms of a legitimate council, the chief priests, scribes, and leaders of the people assembled in great numbers, summoned Jesus to their council and questioned him, hunting for something in his words that they could charge him with. At the trial a charge was being sought, and with death already decided on, they were looking around for a pretext on which a case for death could be asserted. So they said, 'If you are the Christ that we are waiting for according to the predictions of the prophets, tell us.' Now Jesus knew that they were

* * * * *

64 Erasmus formulates elements of repentance here – recognition of former virtue and present sin, removal from evil company, and tears that witness to repentance and wash away sin – in terms reminiscent of his paraphrase on the parable of the prodigal son in chapter 15 above. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1918C–1919B comments on cleansing tears that confess what we are ashamed to put into words. Cf also the paraphrase on Mark 1:5 CWE 49 16 and n27.

asking not in order to learn the truth but so that they could ferret out a false charge. He replied, 'If I tell you who I am, you will not believe me. But if I ask you what kind of a Messiah has been promised on the evidence of the Scriptures, and whether those marks fit me, you will not answer me sincerely, because you do not desire to learn or to teach what is true. Nor will you set me free if I make my innocence clear. For in your questioning you are not aiming at what customarily happens in legitimate councils, that once the truth is known you either set an innocent man free or condemn a wrongdoer. Your aim is this, that what you have determined to do you may do with a show of justice. So I will not say what you do not want to know, though you already do know it, but I will say what you will discover to be true. The Son of Man, who now because of the weakness of his flesh and his lowliness goes unrecognized by you in your arrogance, will shortly be on high, sitting at the right hand of the divine majesty.' Jesus said this so that since they preferred to kill Christ the lowly, through whom they could have been saved, rather than embrace him, they would know that they were going to see as judge and avenger of their ungodliness the very one they refused to recognize as the saviour promised and expected for so many generations.

That remark seemed to them all a suitable handle for an accusation,[65] if only he would openly proclaim himself the Son of God. So they said, 'Then you are the Son of God of whom the predictions of the prophets speak?' At this Jesus so framed his answer that he neither denied that he was what he was nor provided them with a handle for an accusation nor gave the appearance of arrogance about himself. The Lord indeed everywhere preferred to make his divine nature known in deeds rather than proclaim it in words. So he replied, 'You say that I am,' modestly implying that what they were asking as an uncertainty could be asserted in the same words if one only changed the intonation.[66] But judging that this was a sufficiently suitable reason to accuse him of blasphemy, the worst crime among the Jews, they said, 'Why are we still looking for evidence? We ourselves have

* * * * *

65 'Handle,' here and just below, alludes again to *Adagia* I iv 4: *Ansam quaerere*; see chapter 20 n30 above.

66 Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1921B–C comments that in this reply Jesus preferred to confirm rather than declare his kingship so as not to provide a reason for condemning him to those who would admit the truth of their charge by making it. The remark is repeated throughout the Latin exegetical tradition on this passage. Hugh of St Cher (on 22:70) 265r adds that Jesus asserts the truth of what his inquisitors say by changing their question into a statement.

heard undeniable blasphemy out of his mouth.' The vote for this view[67] was easy and unanimous, since they had decided to kill Jesus on any pretext whatever.

Chapter 23

Once a justification good enough, as they thought, for his death had been found, the next thing was to transfer the resentment it would cause from themselves to others. They decided to force the prisoner on the governor Pilate, so that he would seem to have been killed not by Jews but by gentiles. So the entire council rose, along with the crowd that they had drawn into partnership in the ungodly deed, and led Jesus to Pilate the governor of Judea. (He held the magistracy there in Caesar's name, though he was not a Jew himself.)[1]

Here for the first time the nation of the Jews handed its own Messiah, sent to it, over to the gentiles and removed him from itself. The gentiles embraced and adored the one thus entrusted to them. In the council of the Jews, for whom any excuse, however trivial, would suffice, the Lord had already been condemned before his hearing, since in their madness they craved the death of an innocent man.[2] Since there was more fairness at the tribunal of a pagan judge, they had to use suborned witnesses to make their many grave charges against the one who alone of all was free from every crime. The beginning of the accusation, then, was this: 'We caught this man stirring up our people to revolution, because he forbade the paying of tribute to Caesar and announced that he was the king Messiah.' They thought these two charges elegantly contrived to trouble the governor greatly because each concerned treason against Caesar; so the shameless contrivers of lies attack the gospel truth. What is more shameless than these lies? When the coin was shown to him, Jesus had replied, 'Render to Caesar

* * * * *

67 *in hanc sententiam pedibus discessum*, more literally 'there was a movement [of those voting] to [the side of the chamber representing] this view.' Erasmus uses an idiom familiar from the procedure of the senate in ancient Rome. Cf *Adagia* II vii 12: *pedibus in sententiam discedere* 'To vote with one's feet' CWE 34 8–10, with a full discussion and examples of its use among the Romans.

1 Pilate's position as Roman governor of the Jewish province is noted by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 609C–D.

2 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 609D, followed by the *Gloss* (on 23:1), also makes a rhetorical contrast at this point between innocence and the madness of the Jews, though it is their own feigned innocence, not that of Jesus.

the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's.' He also avoided the kingship offered by the Jews.[3] He had made it plain that he was the Messiah by his very actions; but even if he had declared that he was the Messiah, they should not have used that as a charge against him unless they had shown that the prophets' predictions about the Messiah did not fit him. Their hope of victory lay in the numbers of conspirators and the solitariness of the prisoner and finally in the judge, a godless man, as they supposed.

Pilate, though a worshipper of idols, was still much more fair-minded than the priests of the Jews. He disregarded the first charge about not paying tribute to Caesar, either because he realized it was contrived or because it was no new thing for this question to be argued among the Jews, since the whole sect of the Pharisees felt that God's own people ought not to pay assessments to gentiles.[4] On the matter of kingship he did question Jesus, in whom he saw nothing that looked like kingship. He was alone; his dress and face and the whole comportment of his body proclaimed his unpretentiousness and simplicity.[5] So the governor, having heard the accusers, took Jesus aside and asked him whether he was the king of the Jews, and Jesus replied, 'You say so.' For the Lord in every case adapted his answers so as to establish his own innocence, yet without making an effort to escape the court's judgment, since he had determined to die. He was king of the Jews, he was obliged not to deny it, but it was a different kind of kingdom that he was claiming for himself and his Father.[6] He was king of all things in his divine nature, a nature of which Pilate had no inkling. The man ignorant of the Law and the prophets understood nothing about a gospel kingdom, except that he had heard that the Jews were waiting for

* * * * *

3 For the reference to Caesar's coin, cf 20:24–5. This or its synoptic parallels are almost always cited in treatments of 23:2 by the exegetical tradition; see the next note. For the offer of kingship, cf John 6:15 and the paraphrase on it CWE 46 78.

4 Cf Matt 22:15–22, especially 15, and Mark 12:13–17, especially 13; Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 932D, Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1092A, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:1) allude to the episode described in those passages.

5 Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 86 (87) PG 58 763 (on Matt 27:11) mentions that Jesus earned Pilate's amazement by his silence and unassuming behaviour; Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1092B hypothesizes that Pilate's incredulous question about kingship is a reaction to Jesus' poverty, insignificance, lack of supporters, and 'nakedness,' ie simplicity of dress.

6 For the different kind of kingdom cf John 18:36, a verse cited in treatments of this episode by Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 86 (87) PG 58 763 (on Matt 27:11) and Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:3).

a Messiah, some kind of king, a rumor in which the quite unsuperstitious man did not put much credence.

So, even though he did not understand Jesus' answer, well aware in any case of the Jews' spitefulness and drawing his own conclusions about Jesus' unpretentiousness from his appearance, he went out to the priests of the Jews and the crowd that had gathered. 'I have examined the man,' he said, 'on the charges brought against him; I find nothing culpable[7] in him.' But they, knowing that they could not succeed by arguments, raised an outcry, linking charge to charge and lie to lie: 'But he is a revolutionary; he is stirring up the people with his teaching throughout the whole of Judea, starting from Galilee all the way to this city.' This of course is the particular crime of the gospel truth, that it stirs up the people and foments revolt – when the ungodly rise up against the truth they hate. Yet this uprising is not to be imputed to the preachers of the gospel, but to the incurable malice of persons who prefer to crush the truth that heals rather than to lay aside the disease in their heart.[8] For the gospel teaching disturbs the people not otherwise than a medicine causes a shock to the body; if such a shock does not take place, the whole organism necessarily dies.

This accusation did move Pilate slightly, for he saw that the whole business was being carried on by the leading men in concert and by certain ones of the people who were instruments of the leaders' malice. Hence he wanted to remand both the prisoner and the accusers to investigation by someone else, so that if he were unable to free Jesus, at least he himself would be freed from dealing with the case.[9] He seized at the handle[10] offered by the one word 'Galilee,' the region of which Herod was tetrarch.

* * * * *

7 *nihil criminis.* The paraphrase uses Erasmus' suggestion in the annotation *nihil invenio causae* (on 23:4) that *nihil criminis* is a better translation of the Greek οὐδὲν αἴτιον than the Vulgate *nihil causae* 'no fault' (AV) (presumably because it more specifically denotes a criminal charge). Cf n18 below.

8 The rhetorical reversal Erasmus makes – that the revolution will be of the ungodly rising against the truth – may owe its inspiration to Bede's remark, *In Lucam expos* PL 92 610B, that 'this speech of his accusers shows rather the innocence of the accused and the criminality of the accusers.' But the comparison to medical treatment in the next sentence is Erasmus' own.

9 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 610C–D, the *Gloss* (on 23:6), and Hugh of St Cher (on 23:7) 265v point out that by sending Jesus to Herod Pilate is trying to avoid pronouncing judgment on or condemning an innocent man. Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1093C says that Roman law required people to be judged by the heads of their own regions, a view that may bear on what Pilate is said to have understood, three sentences below.

10 Another allusion to *Adagia* I iv 4: *Ansam quaerere;* cf chapter 20 n30 above.

So he inquired whether Jesus was a Galilean. The answer was that he was, because he was generally believed to be from Nazareth, for he had been brought up and had lived there.[11] So when Pilate understood that investigation of the prisoner was within Herod's jurisdiction, he remanded him to Herod, who happened to be in Jerusalem just at that time. Yet this too was done by dispensation of God's purpose, so that our Lord Jesus might bring back from every tribunal evidence of his innocence, and so that the wickedness of the priests, scribes, and leaders might be more thoroughly exposed.

When Herod saw Jesus brought before him, he was glad at the sight. For quite some time now a desire, even a lust, to see Jesus, of whom he had heard so much, had gripped the man. And now he hoped that Jesus would perform some miracle while he watched, like the numerous ones he had heard Jesus had done. So he questioned Jesus on a variety of points, wanting to tease something out of him not so that he, Herod, might be made better but to oblige his curiosity. For he asked Jesus nothing different from what he would have asked any wonder-worker.[12] Jesus, however, had not come to be an instrument of a godless prince's lust but to obtain salvation for everyone. He made no reply, thereby teaching us that sometimes the gospel word is not to be dispensed, when it is evident that the hearers are unworthy.[13] Meanwhile the priests and scribes pressed him and accused him hotly[14] to Herod, dreadfully afraid that the prisoner would somehow

* * * * *

11 Jesus' upbringing in Nazareth of Galilee, mentioned at 2:39–40 and variously in the other synoptics, is recalled here by Hugh of St Cher (on 23:6) 265v and by Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:6), who says *quia fuit ibi nutritus et conversatus* 'because he was brought up and lived there.' Erasmus' language is similar: *nam illic nutritus fuerat et versatus* 'for he had been brought up and had lived there.'

12 Herod's thrill-seeking curiosity about the prisoner, without serious interest, is noted by the *Gloss* (on 23:9), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1093C, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:8 and 9).

13 Gregory the Great *Moralia* 22.38 PL 76 235C–236A cites this passage in Luke as evidence that preachers ought to allow themselves to be scorned without replying if their audience cannot be benefited; Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1093D–1096A similarly says that the absence of an answer to Herod's mocking question spares him condemnation for not heeding what he did not take seriously. Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:9) points out Herod's unworthiness and the model of forbearance Jesus offers preachers. Cf Matt 7:6.

14 The annotation *constanter accusantes* (on 23:10) had pointed out that *constanter* 'insistently' is not as accurate a translation of the Greek ἐντόνως as *acriter* 'hotly' would be; the paraphrase follows this observation.

slip out of their grasp. Herod, godless king though he was, was nonetheless indifferent to their accusations, understanding of course that the whole affair proceeded from their resentment. Thinking it sufficient to scorn the one by whom he had been scorned, by way of mockery he had Jesus dressed in a white garment (for that was the mark of kings and emperors)[15] and sent him back to Pilate.

Our Lord Jesus endured this shameful treatment by the thickheaded king and the armed guard who were the king's escorts so that like lips would have like lettuce.[16] Indeed, with this class of men a tightrope walker or a juggler would get more glory than a simple preacher of gospel truth.[17] They want either to be entertained or to learn things that are advantageous to their tyranny. Even so, here the civil behaviour of Herod condemned the godlessness of the priests and scribes and found the prisoner innocent, since he did not condemn one accused but silent in the face of the charges against him. Then too it was gratifying that Pilate had so much respect for him, Herod, that he made an opportunity for him to see Jesus. And so from that day a friendship was formed between Herod and Pilate, although before then there had been animosity between them. But it is a godless peace that is cemented by wrongdoing against the gospel truth.

When Pilate saw that the prisoner was sent back to him and that his attempt had not succeeded, instead of Jesus' judge he began to be his

* * * * *

15 The purple (John 19:2) and scarlet (Matt 27:28) in which Jesus is dressed by mocking soldiers are normally interpreted as the colours of royalty by the exegetical tradition, eg Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1922B–C, Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 27 PL 26 216C. For the ancient Greeks and Romans purple was the color of royalty, not white. The 'white' (*alba*) in the Vulgate translates a Greek word that means 'shining' and is translated 'gorgeous' in RSV and 'elegant' in NRSV; see the note in Fitzmyer AB Luke on verse 11. Erasmus has no annotation on the word. This passing comment may be only a slip, since in the excursus on 24:27 he identifies white more conventionally as a mark of priesthood (263 below).

16 Cf *Adagia* I x 71: *Similes habent labra latucas* 'Like lips like lettuce' CWE 32 264. Erasmus' comment on this proverb includes a quotation from Jerome Ep 7.5, who attributes the remark to an otherwise humourless Roman on observing a bristly-mouthed donkey eating thistles.

17 The disdain for an ignorant crowd bent on its own mindless amusements is reminiscent of the prologue to the *Hecyra* of Terence, Erasmus' preferred Roman comic playwright. The prologue to the play's third staging describes how the stupid audience at the first two, aborted, performances had been drawn away by the livelier attractions of tightrope walkers, boxers, and gladiators.

advocate. Summoning the priests, scribes, leaders, and the people who accompanied them, he spoke to them as follows: 'You have brought this man before me as one who is turning your people away from obedience to Caesar and your laws, and in your presence I have endeavoured by various questions to fish out the truth from him; but I do not find him guilty of any of the charges[18] on which you have accused him. The same was Herod's finding, who was better able than I to judge in these matters, as being learned in your laws, and for that reason I remanded the investigation to his tribunal.[19] If he had found him guilty he would not have allowed him to slip out of his grasp. As it is, since he found no capital crime in him, he contented himself with a light punishment and only mocked the man, absolving him, that is, of capital jeopardy. Therefore it behoves us also to imitate Herod's fair-mindedness. I shall chastise him with some non-capital punishment and let him go.' The governor did this hoping that when the Jews saw Jesus afflicted with so many jibes and insults their rage would abate.[20]

When Pilate made no headway by this method either and the madness of the Jews was further exasperated, he hit upon another contrivance for absolving Jesus. Among the Jews it was customary that for the observance of their festival day the governor would release to them one of the criminals, one that they themselves had demanded. So, anticipating their demand, the governor put the question to them, which of the two they wanted granted

* * * * *

18 'Guilty of any of the charges' is *ulli horum criminum obnoxium*. In the annotation *nullam causam* (on 23:14) Erasmus had again noted the inadequacy of the Vulgate *causa* as a translation for αἴτιον or αἰτία in the Greek text (cf n7 above) and had noted the same poor translation in the Vulgate of verse 22. The paraphrase accordingly substitutes expressions with *crimen* 'charge' in both places.

19 This sentence is Erasmus' paraphrase on the Vulgate verse 15a, *sed neque Herodes: nam remisi vos ad illum* 'No, nor yet Herod: for I sent you to him' (AV); cf Nestle-Aland or Fitzmyer AB Luke on verse 15 for discussion of the text. Erasmus' Luke gives Pilate a professed reason for having sent Jesus to Herod somewhat different from the narrator's own reason; cf the paraphrase on verse 6 and n9 above. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 610D, followed by the *Gloss* (on 23:7), notes that Herod is Jewish by birth and religion, and so is granted an opportunity to give his opinion about Jesus.

20 The same idea, that Pilate hoped the Jews' outraged feelings would be satisfied by seeing that Jesus had been beaten, is prominent in the paraphrase on John 19:1–4; cf CWE 46 207 and the notes there. Traditional exegesis of Luke made the same point here but more emphatically on verse 22; Erasmus prefers to emphasize it here. Cf Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 612B and 613A, followed by the *Gloss* (on 23:22); Hugh of St Cher (on 23:16) 266v and (on 23:22) 267r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:16).

to them for the festival day, Jesus or Barabbas.[21] Barabbas was a notorious brigand, well known for his evil deeds, who had stirred up a revolt in the city and murdered one of the citizens, and for that reason had been thrown into prison.[22] Since the governor knew that this man was widely hated in the city he hoped that they would allow Jesus, who had done well by many of them, to be let go more readily than a man who was an enemy of public tranquillity.

But so great was the madness of the priests and their hangers-on that they demanded that Barabbas be released to them and Jesus be raised on the cross – which both really was the worst type of punishment because of the long-drawn-out torture and for the same reason was considered the most shaming. So completely did the Jews overlook no part of cruelty! It seemed best to the divine purpose that Jesus, the wellspring and source of all glory, should come to such a depth of contempt that he was considered worth less than a revolutionary and a murderer; this was to prevent our losing heart if ever on account of Christ's name and teaching we are spurned by those who love this world.[23]

When Pilate saw that he was not accomplishing anything this way either, he again approached them, trying whether he might somehow be able to soothe their tempers with words and set the innocent Jesus free. But again they became more provoked and chanted their rabid song: 'Crucify, crucify him!' Not even at this did Pilate yield to their outcries, but tried a third time

* * * * *

21 The paraphrase here is much filled out from the other synoptics. At Matt 27:15–17 and 21 and Mark 15:6–9 the custom of the Romans' releasing a prisoner in connection with the Jewish festival is noted, Barabbas is identified as a notorious criminal then being held, and Pilate puts the question, which of the two they wanted.
Verse 17, paraphrased in this sentence and the two preceding ones, is omitted by modern scholars entirely; see Nestle-Aland and Fitzmyer AB Luke on 23:17.

22 In the text of this Gospel the description of Barabbas' criminality occurs in verse 19, following the statement of the crowd's demand for his release in verse 18. Erasmus moves the paraphrase on 19 to precede the paraphrase on 18, thus establishing a narrative sequence more like the one found in Matt 27:15–21 and Mark 15:6–11; cf the preceding note. That Barabbas was a brigand (*latro* in the Vulgate) is reported at John 18:40.

23 Death on the cross is especially long drawn out and therefore is evidence of the extreme cruelty of the Jews, according to Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 612C–D, followed by the *Gloss* (on 23:21) and Hugh of St Cher (on 23:21) 267I. Hugh adds that there are two points to be noted, the pain and the shame. For the shame of crucifixion cf Phil 2:8 and Heb 12:2, and Heb 12:3 for the moral example against losing heart provided in Jesus' death by crucifixion.

to control them, saying, 'I am a judge. I have no right against the innocent, I cannot inflict death on one in whom I find no crime that deserves death.[24] What then has he done worthy of death? I have interrogated him, and I find no crime in him punishable by death. If there is some lesser offence, this much will be conceded to your temper: I will administer correction[25] to him and let him go.' But against this fair-mindedness on the part of the judge they pressed on stubbornly, demanding not by argumentation but by mad clamouring that Barabbas be let go and Jesus crucified.[26]

The governor had tried everything and saw that their outcry was growing stronger and stronger. So he called for water[27] and, giving witness to Jesus' innocence and condemning the Jews' stubborn malice, he pronounced sentence of death against Jesus, not according to his own thinking but according to the will of the Jews, who were demanding[28] the source of life and salvation for bloodshed. And he released to them Barabbas, a revolutionary and a murderer, whom they had preferred to Jesus. But Jesus he surrendered to them, to do to him as they pleased.

After they had practised every kind of mockery against him to satisfy their hatred, they put his own clothes back on him so that he would be more recognizable to the people, and led him out to the place of crucifixion, carrying his own cross, as was usual.[29] On their way they happened to

* * * * *

24 For Erasmus' views on *causam mortis* 'cause of death' in verse 22, here paraphrased as *crimen morte dignum* 'crime that deserves death' and *crimen morte plectendum* 'crime punishable by death' cf nn7 and 18 above.

25 The annotation *emendatum ergo* (on 23:16) had noted that the Greek word παιδεύσας became in the Vulgate of verse 16 *emendatum* and in verse 22 *corripiam*. But better Latin, Erasmus said, would be the words *corripere*, correction by words more than by blows, or *castigare*, chastisement in either mode. The paraphrase introduces *castigare* in verse 16 and retains *corripere* here.

26 For a similar portrayal of Pilate as a just judge, cf the paraphrase on John 18:36 CWE 46 206. The contrast between rationality and the crowd's maddened passion is pointed out by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 613B, followed by the *Gloss* (on 23:23) and Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:13).

27 Cf Matt 27:24 for Pilate's calling for water and washing his hands as a sign of his own and Jesus' innocence.

28 Were demanding' (*efflagitabant*) is the paraphrased version of the Vulgate's *petitionem eorum* 'their request,' adapted from the annotation *petitionem eorum* (on 23:24), which had said that the Jews were urgently and insistently demanding (*efflagitant enim ac postulant*).

29 In Matt 27:27–31, Mark 15:16–20, and John 19:1–3 the soldiers mock Jesus (and in Matthew and Mark reclothe him in his own garments); Erasmus retains the unidentified but presumably Jewish 'they' found as subject in Luke 23:26 but adds the reclothing. Jesus does not carry his own cross in Luke or in Matt

meet one Simon, from Cyrene, coming from his country place.[30] They put the Lord's cross on this man willy-nilly,[31] so that he carried it and Jesus went in front of him, not to spare Jesus but so that they could finish what they were doing more quickly. But by God's purpose a figure thereby was provided of gathering the church from the gentiles, for the church embraced the cross of Jesus and walked in his footsteps.[32]

Now a sizeable crowd of the people and of women accompanied Jesus. Though the priests and scribes were rejoicing, the women were wailing and lamenting the death of an innocent man. For there was nothing else that the humble and weak could do against the concerted godlessness of the powerful.[33] But Jesus wanted his death to be glorious, not mournful, and he wanted it adored, not bewailed,[34] since it was being freely un-

* * * * *

27:32 or Mark 15:21. At John 19:17 he does carry the cross, but there is no mention of Simon of Cyrene. Cf n32 below.

30 *ex villa sua*. Erasmus has added 'his' (*sua*) to the Vulgate phrase, though the Greek ἀπ' ἀγροῦ means 'from the country.' *Villa* in classical Latin normally means a rural homestead or estate; in later Latin it can also mean a country village or district and translates πάγος, as explained by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 614A.

31 *volenti nolenti*, a version of *Adagia* I iii 45: *Nolens volens*. But the annotator at CWE 31 274 points out that Erasmus' explanation of the adage takes it to mean being in a state of uncertainty, rather than being forced to do something, like it or not. The latter, the more familiar English meaning, is the one being used here.

32 The exegetical tradition, beginning at least from Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1923B–C and Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 933D–934A, notes that both the synoptic version, with Simon carrying the cross, and the Johannine version, with Jesus carrying it (cf n29 above) are correct, since Jesus would have carried it part of the way and Simon the rest of the way. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 613C–614A says that Simon, as a *paganus* 'man from the country,' symbolizes the pagans who will take up the cross and follow in the Lord's footsteps, alluding to 9:23; he is echoed by the *Gloss* (on 23:26) and Hugh of St Cher (on 23:26) 267v. Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:26) says that the motive for pressing Simon into service was to hurry the process along.

33 The mixture of motives in the crowd that followed Jesus to crucifixion is noted by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 614A and C, who also says that the lack of respect accorded women gave them the freedom to show their opposition to male leadership more openly, since no one would pay much attention. He is followed by the *Gloss* (on 23:27) and, in part, Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:27). Erasmus broadens this into an analogy between women and all politically powerless people.

34 The sentence up to this point, along with 'The death of an innocent person is not to be mourned' immediately below, was censured by Béda and the

dertaken for the salvation of the whole world. So he checked their lamenting, unseemly though proceeding from devoted affection. 'Daughters of Jerusalem,' he said, 'do not weep for me, but weep for your own and your children's fate. The death of an innocent person is not to be mourned; there should be wailing for the destruction of those who for their misdeeds will suffer wretched slaughter here and condemnation to eternal punishment in the hereafter. Such a heartrending disaster is threatening this area that people are going to call the women who have not borne children blessed and the wombs that have produced no offspring happy and the breasts that have never given milk fortunate. For a mother's devoted affection is more gravely tormented in her children's troubles than in her own.

'Now they rejoice as if in a deed well done, but when the day of divine vengeance comes, so much terror at the threatening evils will seize their hearts that they will say to the mountains, "Fall on us," and to the hills, "Cover us over." For if they do these things in the green wood, what will happen in the dry wood?' In this riddling statement our Lord Jesus gave witness to his perfect innocence, because he alone of humankind was flawed by no decay of vices or lusts, but was entirely abloom and forever budding forth in every sort of virtue. But if their wickedness produced such an example against a person blameless in every way, what kind of example is rightly produced against those who, corrupted in every part by base lust, could not be brought to any good fruit?[35]

* * * * *

Paris faculty of theology for suggesting that mourning Jesus' death is wrong. Erasmus' various replies, in the *Divinationes* LB IX 493C–D, *Supputatio* LB IX 617C–619E, and *Declarationes* LB IX 822E–824C and 824D–827A, assert proper and improper modes of mourning – the spiritual emotions attendant on recollection of the salvific event versus the ordinary emotional response to the real or enacted suffering of anyone, even an innocent, that Jesus is forbidding here. He quotes Bede and Theophylact in support and argues that the words must be understood as reflecting Jesus' and Luke's positions in the context of the narrative, not as uncontextualized pronouncements. Cf Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 614A and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1100C.

35 The exegetical tradition recognized the allusion in 29–31 to 21:20–4, the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem. Hugh of St Cher (on 23:29) 267v and Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:29) note the anxiety of mothers in defeated cities for their children. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 615A–B compares Jesus the green wood, that is, the everlasting tree of life, to the barren dry wood of sinners and ungodly persons; he is followed by the *Gloss* (on 23:31) and Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:31). The theme is elaborated by Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1100D and Hugh of St Cher (on 23:31) 268r.

In such a procession did Jesus our prince and king go forth to his triumph.[36] At the same time two others were being led out, criminals,[37] condemned as he was, but not for the same reason. This had also been arranged by the Jews, to make Jesus more disgraced in the eyes of the crowd for being linked with such company. Even the place was chosen because it was shameful and dismal from the execution of criminals. Its name was Golgotha, from its appearance, because it was white with the skulls and bones of the people executed there.[38] Here then Jesus was crucified between two thieves, as though he who was their comrade in punishment had been their comrade in crime. But whatever the wickedness of the Jews could devise to disgrace our Lord Jesus he turned to his glory and our salvation. For he who though innocent willingly lowers himself to save humankind earns more glory with both God and humankind to the degree that he submits to greater disgrace. So it seemed best to the divine wisdom to break our pride by the most remarkable example possible, since we seek praise from our fellow human beings even for our wrongdoings.

But now Jesus, raised on high and indeed to the watchtower from which he was going to call all things back to himself,[39] chose to give the most complete example of perfect forbearance. Though innocent, though in so many ways a benefactor, he had suffered so many evils, so many insults, so many jeers! Even as he hung on the cross, which generally makes even

* * * * *

36 For the figure of the triumph, cf Col 2:15 and the paraphrase on 19:38 and 40 above. Ambrose had begun his discussion of 23:26–38 with a long, detailed analogy between the crucifixion and a Roman triumph, *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1923B–1925C. Erasmus returns to the theme below, in the extended paraphrase on verse 34, 'But let us not take our eyes from this example,' etc.

37 'Criminals' is *facinorosi*. Erasmus' annotation *duo nequam* (on 23:32) briefly suggested *malefici* or *facinorosi* in preference to the Vulgate's *nequam* 'wicked.' Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:32) says that the Jewish leaders had arranged the triple execution to defame Jesus in the eyes of the populace.

38 Calvary in the text of Luke is suppressed; Golgotha is in Matt 27:33, Mark 15:22, and John 19:17, all of which add *Calvariae locus* 'place of the skull' (*κρανίου τόπος* in Greek) as a translation of the Hebrew word. None of these explains the meaning of the name in the explicit terms Erasmus uses here. The use of the site as an execution ground is emphasized by Jerome, arguing against the attractive but false belief that Adam was buried there, in *Comm in Matthaeum* 27 PL 26 217B–C, a passage quoted by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 615C and the *Gloss* (on 23:33).

39 Cf the lifting of Jesus on high in John 3:14 and 12:32, and the paraphrases on those passages CWE 46 48 and 155. For the watchtower cf the paraphrase on Luke 19:40 above, where Erasmus explains the meaning of 'Zion.'

murderers deserving of pity, they assailed him with bitter abuse, which could be harder for a person to bear than dying. He was so far from avenging himself, so far from returning insult for insult, that he prayed to his Father for those at whose hands he was suffering undeservedly. 'Father,' he said, 'forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing.' Such indeed was the holy prayer of our high priest on the altar of the cross as he made the one sacrifice of the paschal lamb for the salvation of the whole world. And the prayer was not without effect. For many of those who had driven the Lord to the cross out of error, when they learned the truth from the apostles' preaching, confessed the name of the crucified one.[40] Yet even the Pharisees' malice was not entirely without error, but not such as to free them from condemnation. They could indeed have been without error, except that the base lusts to which they were enslaved prevented them. But even among them there were those who persecuted the Lord in the same spirit as Paul persecuted the church of God.

– If you consider here, excellent Theophilus, Jesus' perfect innocence, the perfect kindness to all, the perfect spiritual endowments, in which he had no equal; and on the other side regard the hatred, abuse, insults, deceits, snares, accusations, disgraces, torments, and the type of death which the godlessness of the Jews inflicted on him; and if you hear him on the cross itself in the midst of the abuse beseeching the Father not to take vengeance but to pardon the authors of so great a wrong, will not a person seem extremely shameless who, though he professes himself Christ's disciple, in his godlessness plots vengeance against a fellow sinner, even if he is wounded by a serious injustice? Then how much do they fall short of Christ's example who for some trivial insult draw the sword against their neighbour's vitals? Or those who do not digest some mildly insulting expression tossed at them but instead strike at whole cities, whole kingdoms, in dismal wars and drive whole nations to mutual bloodshed? In truth, let us not take our eyes from this example, and let us imitate our king, on the cross conquering all the power of the tyrant Satan, defeating the whole might of this world, tri-

* * * * *

40 For the figure of Christ the high priest and his sacrifice cf Hebrews 4–8 and 9:28, 1 Cor 5:7, 1 John 2:2. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 616C–D has a long comment here on Luke's theme of the priesthood of Christ and Jesus' priestly function in interceding for his persecutors (or at least those of them who honestly did not know what they were doing) and opening paradise to the repentant thief. He is followed by the *Gloss* (on 23:34), Hugh of St Cher (on 23:34) 268v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:34). For persecutors of Christ who later believed because of the apostles' teaching, cf eg Acts 2:22–41.

umphing over all the powers that raise themselves against the gospel truth, truth which must not conquer, must not triumph, otherwise than under the banner of its prince. Let us behold our high priest, in his efficacious sacrifice expiating the sins of the nations of the whole world, paying the penalty for all generations on behalf of us all, if only we embrace in single-hearted faith what he freely offers us, acknowledging our own unrighteousness and lovingly praising his ineffable goodness towards us. Unhappy sinner, whither are you turning? The Lord cries out, 'Father, forgive them,' and do you in despair for yourself either ready a noose like Judas or heap up one self-reproach on another? There is no reason for you to fear Satan's power hereafter. Christ has conquered, and he has conquered for you. From the tree on high, visible to all nations, he invites you; the three horns of the cross themselves invite from afar Asia and Europe and Africa to fellowship in eternal salvation.[41] –

Well then: Jesus hung naked on the cross, so that the one carrying out the heavenly sacrifice would not possess anything of this world, thereby teaching how bishops of the gospel ought to possess affections unmarred by desire for any earthly thing.[42] Meanwhile, as if he were not going to live again, the soldiers who crucified him cast lots and divided the Lord's garments among them. For this was a kind of bonus for their criminal services.[43] Jesus wanted these spoils of himself to be with the soldiers. With us who proclaim his name he wanted there to be nothing physical of himself, so that we may now love him in spirit. So even today his garments are with us, as he daily hangs on the cross for us. Indeed, all that is his is ours, but according to the spirit.

So as Jesus hung there in this way, apparently defeated and bereft of all hope, the priests, scribes, Pharisees, and leaders of the people, together with the soldiers who had crucified him,[44] assailed him with taunts,

* * * * *

41 For the figure of the 'horns of the cross' cf its reappearance near the end of the long excursus on 24:27 (267 below) and n133 there.

42 Jesus' visibility to all from his lofty place on the cross (at the end of the preceding paragraph), and his nakedness there, freed from all earthly trappings, is noted by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1924C–1925C and (on verse 46) by Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1108C.

43 Cf the paraphrase on John 19:23 CWE 46 212–13 and n35. Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1101C cites this idea, only to dismiss it, as a possible reason for the soldiers' dividing the garments.

44 The paraphrase omits the first main clause of verse 35, 'And the people stood by watching.' Erasmus had a philological note on the clause in the *Annotations*, so he knew it as part of the text.

reproaching him because while he was said to have helped many with his miracles now he could not aid himself. 'He saved others,' they said; 'now let him be his own saviour, if he is the Christ that he boasted he was, if he is the one dear to God and God's chosen Son.' The leading men were flinging this abuse at him in the hearing of the people, who generally marvelled at Christ's miracles, so that they could turn popular sentiment against him. In fact they even took all authority from him, as if proving by the very fact of his crucifixion that he was neither the Messiah nor the Son of God he had claimed to be if he would not come down from the cross. Yet the salvation of the world was based not on his descent but on his perseverance. Salvation was more important to Jesus than the insults of the leaders.

The soldiers too, a thickheaded class of people and either ignorant of or contemptuous of the Jewish religion, mocked Jesus for allegedly having claimed for himself kingship over the Jews; they were stirred up, of course, by the example of the Jewish leaders. And holding up vinegar to him, they jeered at him, saying, 'If you are the king[45] of the Jews, unleash your power and pull yourself out of this danger.' In the midst of all this, Jesus presented a perfect example of mildness, keeping silence in the face of all insults. Furthermore, there was also an inscription attached to the top of the cross, over his head, in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew lettering, so that it could be read by all nations: 'This is the king of the Jews.'[46] That too was thought to have been done to mock him.

Not even these things were enough. One of the two criminals, who was hanging at Jesus' side, flung insults at him from the cross, saying, 'If you are

* * * * *

Some versions of the second clause of verse 35 read 'and the leaders with them derided him' (DV); cf Nestle-Aland and Fitzmyer AB Luke on the verse. Augustine *De consensu evangelistarum* 3.15 quotes Matt 27:41–3 here (41 says 'leaders of the priests along with the scribes and elders') and says that while Mark omits the elders, Luke's *principes* 'leaders' is a general term for all the leading persons, including scribes and elders. Erasmus follows Augustine and also amplifies the biblical text's 'with them' as 'with the soldiers,' not 'with the people.'

45 *ille rex*. In the annotation *si tu es rex* (on 23:37) Erasmus had noted that the Greek subjective complement 'king' is prefaced, contrary to usual Greek practice, with the definite article 'the'; the equivalent Latin would thus require the demonstrative *ille rex* '*the* king,' 'that (well-known, particular) king.' Cf his comments on the use of the Greek definite article and Latin demonstrative towards the end of the annotation *in principio erat verbum* (on John 1:1, at *caeterum illud proprius ad hoc institutum pertinet* 'but the following bears more closely on this point').

46 Erasmus paraphrases an older version of verse 38, which included the words 'in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew letters'; cf John 19:20 and Nestle-Aland on 23:38.

the Christ, the saviour of the world, save yourself and us too.' But the other of the thieves, noting Jesus' amazing mildness, chided his partner in crime and punishment, saying, 'If you have no respect for human beings when you are on the point of death, you who are insulting a dying man surely ought to fear God, especially since you are the man's partner in punishment; this alone should have kept you from abusing him even if he were your partner in crime.[47] In fact his situation is quite different from ours. We are paying the price for our evil deeds; he is dying an innocent man. And it is doubly inhuman to curse one who is both dying and innocent.' A thief on the cross gave this witness for Jesus, so that his innocence would be attested from every side. And then he turned to Jesus and said, 'Lord, remember me as you come into your kingdom.' Wonderful faith on the part of a thief, who when he saw one hanging and dying on a cross, himself on the point of death, sought salvation as from a king! And further, Jesus, who had been deaf and dumb to all the insults, was not deaf and dumb[48] to one who made his request in trust. 'I assure you,' he said, 'today you will be with me in paradise' – surely promising rest and refreshment soon after the punishment was completed. How blessed it is to be joined to Jesus always, who always saves, provided only that gospel faith is there![49]

Now it was about the sixth hour of the day, around noon. From this time, when the sun is generally at its brightest, until the ninth hour darkness suddenly arose throughout the whole territory of Jerusalem.[50] For the sun,

* * * * *

47 The annotation *neque tu times deum* (on 23:40) had argued that of the three possible interpretations of 'do you not fear God,' depending on which word is taken with the 'not,' the Greek permits only 'do you not at least fear [if you do not love] God?' But the paraphrase follows one of the possibilities rejected in the annotation, 'do you not fear at least God [if you do not fear human beings]?' This is also the interpretation of Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:40).
A second annotation on the verse, *qui in eadem damnatione es* (ie 'you who are under the same sentence of condemnation'), noted that the Latin relative pronoun *qui* 'who' should have been a causal conjunction 'since' according to the Greek text and some Latin manuscripts known to Erasmus. The paraphrase follows the annotation.

48 Cf Ps 38:13–14.

49 Hugh of St Cher (on 23:43) 270r reports that some interpret Jesus' remark about the good thief being with him in paradise to mean either being in delight and quiet as Jesus will be after death or being in paradise, that is to say, with Jesus. The paraphrase blends these possibilities.

50 'The whole territory of Jerusalem' was to Noël Béda and the Paris faculty of theology an unacceptable substitution for the *universa terra* 'whole earth' or 'whole land' of verse 44. In the *Divinationes* LB IX 493D and *Supputatio* LB IX 619E–620C Erasmus replied that he was not denying that the darkness reached

abhorring such great human godlessness, hid its face before the dying of the one who was the light of the whole world. The earth shook, the rocks leaped apart;[51] every part of nature shuddered at the enormity of the crime. Indeed, even the veil of the temple, which divided the holy of holies from the rest of the temple, untouched by anyone, was split into two pieces, openly proclaiming that the shadows and ceremonies of the Jews would soon come to an end when this sacrifice, which by itself sufficed for the purification of all ages, had been completed.[52]

And when with a great cry Jesus had said, 'Father, into your hands I commend my spirit,' he breathed out his life's breath. In this way it would be clear to everyone that he had not met his end as others generally do when their physical strength has drained gradually away, but that shortly after a mighty shout and words distinctly enunciated he had laid down his life as by an act of will.[53]

The centurion who was posted near the cross to prevent anyone removing persons still alive from the beam, noticed it. Jesus received witness to his innocence from this man too. For the centurion praised God for having made such great power known in Jesus,[54] and said, 'Truly this was a righteous man' – that is, obviously condemning the unrighteousness of the Jews. For whoever pronounces a condemned man innocent makes the one who condemned him guilty. When the whole remaining throng of those who as usual had come out for the spectacle of an execution had seen what took place (and both enthusiasm and hatred for Jesus had attracted quite a

* * * * *

beyond Jerusalem, and that the issue was not a substantive one anyway. Hugh of St Cher (on 23:44) 270v discusses the point.

51 For the earthquake and rocks cf Matt 27:51.

52 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 619C–D, echoed by the *Gloss* (on 23:45), has a similar tropological interpretation of the rending of the temple veil.

53 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 620A, with the *Gloss* (on 23:46) and Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1108B, says that Jesus' commendation of his spirit is a sign not of Jesus' failing strength but of confidence in the power he shares with the Father.

The annotation *in manus tuas commendo* (on 23:46) had quoted Ambrose's observation (in *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1928B–C) that the meaning of *commendare* in contract law, 'to entrust for safe keeping,' was particularly apt, for 'the spirit is good collateral, a good deposit [*depositum*].' The annotation added that the Greek verb παραθεῖναι translated by *commendare* has the same contractual use. The paraphrase alludes to that use in 'he had laid down [*deposuisse*] his life.'

54 The centurion's proclamation is evoked by Jesus' outcry and last breath according to Mark 15:39, as is pointed out by the *Gloss* (on 23:47), Hugh of St Cher (on 23:47) 270v–271r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:47).

few), they went back home beating their breasts, some for grief that a man so innocent and such a doer of good deeds had suffered so undeservedly, and some out of fear of the divine retribution that they guiltily suspected, from the wonders they had seen, was hanging over them. For the one they had seen during his lifetime lowly and contemptible they saw in his death so mighty that all the elements of the universe shook.[55]

– Notice here again, Theophilus, that more good-heartedness is always found among the gentiles than among the Jews, who claimed for themselves credit for godliness and holiness above all others. The centurion glorified God; the Jews only feared retribution, frightened by portents though they could not be overcome by acts of kindness.[56] –

Why, even those attached to Jesus by family ties, or who had been his close friends in his lifetime, stood at some distance, observing what was taking place but for fear not daring to go closer. Among them were also the women who out of eagerness to minister to him and his disciples had followed him from Galilee, witnesses and observers of what was done, but who now, bereft of all hope, did nothing but mourn.

When it was known, then, by many proofs that the Lord was definitely dead, so that no one could argue either that he had not been a true human

* * * * *

55 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 620B, followed by Hugh of St Cher (on 23:48) 271r and Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:48), gives the double explanation of the departing crowd's display, grief at an innocent man's death and fear, felt by those in the crowd hostile to Jesus, that in his dying he had been further glorified.

56 A similar outburst against the obduracy of the Jews, thus compared unfavourably with the proclamation of the centurion, is found in Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1929C.
This address to Theophilus was protested by Noël Béda, who did not like the gentiles being 'always' rated above the Jews. Erasmus *Divinationes* LB IX 493E replied that from the point of view of the Luke-voice of the *Paraphrase* the observation is correct as he wrote it; individual Jews like Peter and Paul are not being compared to this centurion but one race of people, the Jews, with the other race, the gentiles. In Erasmus' own time, he said, even Jews baptized again and again (*[Iudaei] iterum atque iterum tincti*) scarcely endure the name of Christ. It is not clear what 'Jews baptized again and again' might mean. One suggestion is that this is a sarcastic reference to Jewish ritual bathing. Another is that it alludes to Jews or alleged Jews undergoing baptism more than once in various modes of accommodation to the dominant culture; see Brian Pullan *The Jews of Europe and the Inquisition of Venice, 1550–1670* (Totowa, NJ 1983), especially 10, 243, 254. For a discussion of Erasmus' attitude towards Judaism see CWE 63 *Expositions of the Psalms* xlix–lvi. The topic may be usefully pursued also through the indexes and footnotes of the CWE *Correspondence* volumes, or those in Allen. Cf chapter 15 n37.

or that he had not truly died, just here a person presented himself through whom the duty of the Lord's burial would be carried out, a burial that Jesus wanted to be decent and honourable.[57] His life had been mild and lowly; his death was efficacious, his burial splendid, his resurrection glorious. So a man by the name of Joseph opportunely presented himself, from the Judean city of Arimathea, a good and just man, one of those who were looking for the kingdom of God. Although he was one of the leaders of the people (for he was a high-ranking town magistrate), he had never gone along with the intentions and actions of the priests, scribes, and princes of the people; even so, because of the power of those who hated Jesus he did not dare proclaim his heart's attachment. For strength had not yet been given by the Holy Spirit for them to be able to proclaim Jesus' name in spite of everything. Thus since the other disciples were panic-stricken, only Joseph, together with Nicodemus,[58] made bold to take the task of burial on himself, either because support for good men increases after their death or because he judged that the Jews' resentment had now been satisfied by Jesus' dying.

So he approached Pilate, to whom he was known because of his rank, and requested Jesus' body from him. (Pilate did not release it till he had been assured by the centurion that Jesus was already dead.) He took charge of the body, and when it had been taken down from the cross and coated with oils he wrapped it in a linen cloth.[59] He had no hope at this point of resurrection, of which Jesus had made indication to only a few of his disciples, and even that in such a way that in the present circumstances they remembered it more than believed it. But since they considered Jesus to have been a good man and executed contrary to his deserts, they wanted

* * * * *

57 Matt 26:12–13, Mark 14:8, John 12:7 (with the paraphrase on that verse) all indicate that Jesus desired an honourable burial; the parallel passage in Luke 7:36–50 does not.

58 Joseph is identified as a secret disciple of Jesus and Nicodemus as his assistant in the burial, bringing ointment of myrrh and aloes, at John 19:38–9. Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1931D–1932A introduces Nicodemus into his explication of Luke at this point; he is echoed by the *Gloss* (on 23:52). The mention of strength not yet given by the Holy Spirit appears to anticipate the narrative of Acts 2.

59 The Latin exegetical tradition agrees that Joseph's rank and wealth made him known to Pilate and therefore able to approach him. For the centurion's confirmation that Jesus was dead cf Mark 15:44–5. For receiving the body, cf Matt 27:59; for receiving and anointing it, John 19:40–1.
Following his annotation *et posuit eum in monumento* (on 23:53) Erasmus speaks of 'the body' and 'it' instead of the 'him' of the Latin text, which, he says, mistranslates the 'it' of his Greek text.

to honour his memory with a splendid burial. So they laid the body in a tomb in a nearby garden, a new tomb hewn out of solid rock, in which no one had yet been buried. Although these things appeared to be done by the accident of circumstance, they were actually all done by divine plan, so that the Jews would not be able to argue that the tomb had been breached and the body removed or exchanged.[60]

While all this was going on it was the day of Preparation, because on that day they prepared what would be needed to celebrate the sabbath, so they would not have to break the sabbath rest for any reason.[61] And the women who had watched Jesus on the cross from a distance also followed him to burial, so they would know where his body had been laid, and in what place and what state it had been placed, so they would recognize it when they returned. After carefully examining all these things they went back home and prepared aromatics and oils to preserve the Lord's body, although it already had at least been coated with myrrh by Nicodemus. But the women's devout affection wanted something finer to be applied to the corpse. Yet the reason why the Lord had allowed the jar of precious ointment to be poured over him was that he was not going to wait for the ointments of these women, whose devout attentions instead served to strengthen faith in the resurrection.[62] For while they were seeking to anoint a dead man, they found the living man.

But from sundown to the evening of the following day they had rested,[63] according to the requirement of the Law, because it was unlawful to do work on the sabbath. Again after sundown they finished what

* * * * *

60 For the description of the tomb, which incorporates details from the other three Gospels, cf John 19:41, Matt 27:60, Mark 15:46; Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1933A–1934B points out these details. The exegetical tradition agrees that the details all tend to the prevention of any claim that the resurrection was fraudulent.

61 *Parasceve* in the Vulgate and Erasmus' Latin here and in the next paragraph is the transliterated Greek term for 'preparation,' as explained by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 621C–622A, followed by the *Gloss* (on 23:54), Hugh of St Cher (on 23:54) 272r, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:54). The paraphrase omits the second part of verse 54, 'and the sabbath was beginning.'

62 For Nicodemus' role cf nn58 and 59 above. The 'jar of precious ointment' alludes to the gift of the penitent woman; see n57 above. 'Jar' (*alabastrum*) here is the word used at Matt 26:7 and Mark 14:3.

63 The annotation *Sabbato quidem siluerunt* (on 23:56) had preferred *quieverunt* 'they rested' as a translation for ἡσύχασαν rather than the Vulgate's *siluerunt* 'they kept silence.' The paraphrase follows suit with the compound *conquieverant*.

they had begun in preparing ointments and aromatics. At the same time the Lord kept his sabbath, resting in the tomb, the work of salvation already completed on the day of Preparation, so that we would understand that the human race had been restored by the same one by whom it had been created. He finished the making of the world on the sixth day; on the seventh he rested from his work.[64] The same one completed the redemption of the world on the sixth day, that is the day of Preparation, and, as regards his human body,[65] rested in the tomb from his work, until the eighth day dawned, which the Jews do not know but the Christians adore. It is the day of immortality, when rest and weariness, labour and leisure, will no longer alternate with each other, but there will be everlasting happiness; nor will night and day, day and night alternate, but unending light will shine on the eyes of the godly.[66]

Chapter 24

The women's ceasing from their task was a concession to their reverence for the sabbath. As soon as it was lawful to return to work, directly after sundown, the women spent the night busily in their pious but superfluous task. For on the day that is first after the sabbath, that is, the eighth day after a whole sabbath-week is completed, just at daybreak, they hurried to the tomb, bringing with them the aromatics they had prepared. They intended, to be sure, to pay this last honour to him whom they had loved while he lived, even though they had no hope that he would rise again.[1]

* * * * *

64 Nicholas of Lyra (on 23:56) cites part of Exod 20:11, of which this is a paraphrase.

65 *iuxta corpus humanum*. Cf Acts 2:30–1 and the paraphrase on it CWE 50 21, and 1 Pet 3:18 and the paraphrase on it CWE 44 98.

66 Cf Isa 60:19, Rev 21:23 and 22:5. Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 621C–622A compares the six days of God's creation and his rest on the seventh day with the redemption of the world by Jesus' sacrifice on the sixth day of the week and his rest in the tomb on the seventh day, to be followed by his resurrection on the eighth day, analogous in creation history to the resurrection of all the dead, which will be the ultimate Christian sabbath. He is echoed by the *Gloss* (on 23:54). A similar explanation of the Christian sabbath, delivered in a more sheerly explicative manner, is in Isidore of Seville *Etymologiae* 6.18.18–21; more simply, Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1112A.

1 Having laid out the tropological significance of resurrection on the day after the Jewish sabbath, that is, on the eighth day, at the end of chapter 23 (see the concluding note to that chapter above), Erasmus resumes his narrative. Like Bede *In*

Now the mouth of the tomb had been shut with a huge rock, which could scarcely be moved by many men. A seal had been put on it; that was seen to by the Pharisees and scribes, so that no one could secretly steal the dead body and spread an empty rumour that he had risen because he was nowhere to be found. Guards from the governor's cohort had also been put there.[2] But while the women were looking about anxiously to find out how the rock might be moved,[3] all at once they saw that it was taken away and the entrance to the tomb stood open. They made bold to enter; devout affection had given boldness to the sex. They went in but did not find the body of the Lord Jesus.

This state of affairs filled their hearts with dismay, because they had harboured some good hope from the unexpected removal of the rock; then again they were now wondering how the tomb could be empty since a short time before they had seen it shut and under seal.[4] Suddenly there were two angels standing near them, looking like young men with happy, pleasant faces and clothing that flashed like lightning.[5] The very look of the angels announced the triumph of the resurrection.[6] Panic-stricken at the

* * * * *

Lucam expos PL 92 622B–C (on 23:55–6), he incorporates the chronology of Mark 16:1, where the women are said to complete their preparations only after the sabbath ended at sunset, and like Bede he emphasizes their affection for their deceased master. He also explains the cardinal number in the Gospel's phrase 'Day One of the week'; so do eg Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 622D, the interlinear and marginal *Gloss* (on 24:1), Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1112A, Hugh of St Cher (on 24:1) 272v, Valla *Annot in Lucam* 24, and the synoptic parallels.

2 For the security arrangements at the tomb cf Matt 27:60–6 and Mark 15:46.

3 For the women's worry about getting the rock moved cf Mark 16:3.

4 'The unexpected removal of the rock,' with the preceding 'all at once they saw that it was taken away,' accommodates the version of Matt 28:2, where the rock is moved away before the women's eyes; the Latin of the paraphrase suggests, without insisting, that the women see the tomb both still closed and then suddenly open.

5 Luke calls the apparition 'two men' (but 'angels' in verse 23). Mark 16:5 has 'a young man,' Matt 28:2 'an angel,' and John 20:12 'two angels'; cf the paraphrase on the latter verse CWE 46 217 and n7. Nicholas of Lyra (on 24:4) says that Luke's two men means two angels who look like men. As to their clothing, in the annotation *in vestibus fulgentibus* (on 24:4) Erasmus had said that the Greek ἀστραπτούσῃ really means 'flashing like lightning' rather than 'shining'; the paraphrase follows suit.

6 Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 623A, echoed by the *Gloss* (on 24:4) and Hugh of St Cher (on 24:4) 273r, says the angels' dress and expression announce a triumph. Cf the triumphal language Erasmus uses in the paraphrases on 19:38–40 (and n45 there) and 23:31–4 (and n36 there).

unexpected sight, the women turned their faces and their gaze down to the ground, not daring to look directly at the majesty of an appearance sublime beyond human nature. The angels lifted the spirits of the startled women by their calm and pleasant address.[7] 'Women,' they said, 'why do you seek among the tombs of the dead for one who lives? He was indeed buried here, when he was dead. But since he has now come back to life, he is not in the tomb, where the dead have their resting place; he has risen, and goes among the living, himself alive. He had foretold that he would die, he had foretold both the time and the manner of his death, but he had also foretold that he would come back to life on the third day. You believe that he died because you saw it; believe also that he has come back to life. For he will not have deceived you on this latter point when he foretold the truth in the other. Or have grief and confusion of heart produced in you forgetfulness of all that he foretold? Recall how there was not one of these events that he left unforetold when he was still in Galilee. He foretold that it had been laid down in his Father's plan that for the salvation of the human race the Son of Man would be given over into the hands of sinners to be accused, beaten, and exposed to every kind of mockery, and then to be raised on the cross and killed; but he would also come back from death to life on the third day. Recognize the sequence of events. At nightfall on the day of Preparation he was taken down from the cross and buried in this tomb. That counts as the first day from his death. He rested in the tomb for the whole sabbath. Now it is daybreak on the third day, the day when he has risen from below and the day he has chosen to be a fruitful and blessed one for the whole world.' With these words the angels vanished from sight.[8]

Following the angels' advice the women did recall the words of the Lord Jesus in which he had foretold to his disciples both his death and his resurrection; and so they left the tomb and hurried to the eleven apostles and the other disciples, who, gathered here and there in hiding out of fear

* * * * *

7 The tone of the angels' words here, not described by Luke, is characterized by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 623A, followed by the *Gloss* (on 24:4) and Nicholas of Lyra (on 24:4), as intended to console the women; cf Matt 28:5, Mark 16:6, and the paraphrase on John 20:13 CWE 46 217, where Erasmus similarly amplifies the text.

8 The method of counting to the 'third day' is that of Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 624B, who cites Mark 16:2 as giving the necessary information. Bede is followed by the *Gloss* (on 24:7); Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1112B refers to his own discussion of Matt 28:1–8 for a similar method of counting, one of three possibilities (cf PG 123 477D–480B). The angels' vanishing is not reported in any Gospel in this episode, but cf 1:38, Acts 12:10, and Judg 6:21.

of the Jews, were themselves also forgetful of almost all that Jesus had said, and very nearly in despair.[9] To these the women reported what they had seen and heard from the angels. The first woman was deceived by the serpent and enticed the man to sin. Godly women were instructed by angels and invited men to belief. So lest the sex be forever defamed for having transmitted death to men, the happy news of the restoration of life came from the same source from which the cause of death had first come.[10] Now the women who reported this to the apostles were Mary Magdalene the sister of Lazarus, Joanna the wife of Chuza, Herod's procurator, Mary the mother of James the Less, who was also said to be the sister of Mary the mother of the Lord, and some other women who with these regularly accompanied Jesus.[11]

But because of the unbelievable thing they were reporting, the weaker sex found no credence with the apostles, whom the Lord allowed to be slower to believe so that faith in the Lord's resurrection would be strengthened by more proofs.[12] What the women were saying about the sudden sight of angels and about the unexpected removal of the rock from the mouth of the tomb seemed to the apostles and disciples female ravings, because, as they thought, that sex in its feebleness of mind and with its flawed imagination often thinks it sees what it does not see and hears what it does

* * * * *

9 For the disciples' fear of the Jews see John 20:19.

10 Women are said to be the first reporters of the resurrection in compensation for the woman's part in the Fall by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1936C–1937A, echoed by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 624C–D and the *Gloss* (on 24:9); the same idea is in Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 28 PL 26 225C–D, Cyril *Expl in Lucam* PG 72 941C and Hugh of St Cher (on 24:9) 273V. Ambrose's language for the 'transmission' of sin and grace at women's hands, *transfudere*, is repeated by Bede and the *Gloss* and here by Erasmus.

11 Luke only names, without further identifying, Mary Magdalene, Joanna, and 'James' Mary.' Erasmus amplifies with the identifications given by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 624D, repeated in the *Gloss* (on 24:10) and elaborated by Hugh of St Cher (on 24:10) 273V. The identification of the Mary Magdalene also named at 8:3 with the sister of Lazarus is traditional; cf the paraphrases on John 11:1 and 12:3 CWE 46 139 and 149–50 and the notes there. For Joanna see 8:3, for Mary the mother of James the Less, Mark 15:40.

12 Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 24 PL 76 1213C (on Mark 16:14–20) assigns the male disciples' disbelief at the women's report of the resurrection to the purpose of providing a greater number of proofs and thus responding to the doubts of later generations. Gregory is quoted by Bede twice, *In Marcum expos* PL 92 298A–B and on the present passage, *In Lucam expos* PL 92 624D–625A; Bede is echoed by the *Gloss* (on 24:11) and Hugh of St Cher (on 24:11) 273V–274R.

not hear. Though they did not believe that what the women were saying was true, the women's insistence still had enough effect that Peter got up and ran to the tomb. Putting his head inside and peering about,[13] he did not find the body but did see the grave-clothes in which Jesus' body had been wrapped, lying over to one side. Not even so did he believe that the Lord had returned to life, so deep a forgetfulness of what Jesus had said had overtaken[14] him. Instead, he left the tomb wondering to himself what had happened, puzzling whether someone might have stolen the body from the tomb, and thinking over various possibilities as to how and why it was that, though the body was gone, he saw the grave-clothes left behind, as if they had been taken off the body without haste – they could not have been torn away without some trouble, and they were not haphazardly scattered about but neatly put back in their place, and the napkin that had covered Jesus' head set apart from them.[15]

Now it happened that on the same day two of the disciples who had the news from the women about the empty tomb (though no confidence had been put in the women's words) had left Jerusalem and were setting out for a town named Emmaus. Emmaus is about seven miles distant from Jerusalem. And as they went they took up several topics of conversation, as is the usual way in such circumstances, especially when there is some sorrow in the heart. For they were greatly disturbed by the death of the Lord, and by now had almost lost heart and cast away hope. Indeed, their whole talk[16] was of Jesus and all the things they had seen and heard in the

* * * * *

13 *inmisso capite prospiciens.* Erasmus adopts the language of his annotation *et procumbens vidit* (on 24:12), where he had said that the Greek text describes Peter's action as that of a person who puts his head in a window and peers about, rather than the *procumbens* 'falling face down' of the Vulgate.

14 *ceperat* in *1535*. All the other lifetime texts and LB print *cœperat,* but the ligature represents a typographical convention for printing a long *e,* not the verb *coeperat* 'had begun.'

15 For the contradiction between a possible theft of the body and the neat arrangement of the grave-clothes and the separate location of the napkin, cf John 20:5–7 and the paraphrase on that passage CWE 46 217–18.

16 *tota confabulatio.* A notable feature of the Latin in the paraphrase on verses 14–16 is that the set of expressions for 'talk' or 'converse' includes five instances of *confabulari* 'to talk, tell stories' and its noun *confabulatio.* They are translated in the following text as 'telling their stories,' 'talk of,' and 'conversations.' *Fabulari,* the simple verb, used in the Vulgate at the beginning of verse 15, perhaps was the inspiration for this amplification. Erasmus himself had said, in the annotation *loquebantur ad invicem* (on 24:14), that the Vulgate phrase of his lemma would be better replaced by *colloquebantur* 'they conversed' or *confabu-*

days just past. They had loved him as being a remarkable man and a doer of good deeds, and though that splendid expectation of the restoration of the kingdom of Israel had almost slipped from their mind, still it was agreeable even now to reawaken memory of the departed one by telling their stories to one another. Their hearts were in turmoil, and a sort of drowsiness had crept up on them, so that their love for him whom they could not forget was experienced in, so to speak, a dreamlike state.[17]

And then, while they were reviewing many points about Jesus with each other, and conversing back and forth,[18] there he was, the wolf, as they say, in the tale.[19] For Jesus, who had promised that whenever he found two people talking about him he would be in their midst, at that moment displayed in his actual bodily presence what he never ceases to do in spirit.[20] He joined them as if he too were a traveller and offered himself as a companion on the journey, though not with his familiar appearance – not that he did not have the same body he had had before his death, but because, by Jesus' deliberate choice, their vision was prevented from recognizing the person they saw. Blessed comradeship, when two talk of nothing else, discuss nothing else, than Jesus! Blessed are they whom Jesus deigns to join as their companion! But just as our Lord Jesus rejoices to be with those who talk of him, likewise Satan rejoices to be with those who share

* * * * *

labantur, since the same Greek verb was translated by *fabulantur* in verse 15. For Erasmus' fondness for *fabula* 'narrative,' 'story,' 'plot' to mark his 'dramatic' view of the achievement of salvation in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, see Manfred Hoffmann *Rhetoric and Theology: The Hermeneutics of Erasmus* Erasmus Studies 12 (Toronto 1994), the index and especially 250 n96.

17 For Erasmus' association of depression and sleepiness, see the paraphrases on 22:45 above and on John 14:31 CWE 46 175–6.

18 'Back and forth' is *ultro citroque*, *Adagia* I iii 84, translated 'to and fro' in CWE 31 302. Erasmus comments, 'The metaphor is more attractive if applied to disputes, altercation, discussion or quarrels.'

19 *Adagia* III viii 56 and IV v 50: *Lupus in fabula*. Erasmus says this adage is used when the very person who was being discussed suddenly interrupts a conversation. (The English equivalent would be 'speak of the devil.') He cites its appearance in Terence *Adelphi* 537, along with the views of Terence's commentator Donatus on the origin of the proverb; Plautus *Stichus* 577 (not identical in wording), and Cicero *Epistulae ad Atticum* 13.33a.1.

20 Cf Matt 18:20, 'For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them,' cited here by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 625D, echoed by the *Gloss* (on 24:15), Hugh of St Cher (on 24:15) 274r, and Nicholas of Lyra (*moraliter* on 24:16).

the conversations that corrupt good morals,[21] the talk of lust, of fraud, of revenge, of pride, of making money, of defaming one's neighbour. Now since they burned with love for Jesus but also in their human weakness did have doubts about his promises, the Lord played a temporary trick on their eyes and fished out what they thought about him, not that anything was concealed from him but so that in healing their unbelief he might strengthen our faith.

He said, 'What are those subjects you are discussing as you go, with a look on your faces that indicates sadness and grief in your heart?'[22] For if someone happens along into whose bosom we can pour out our pain, doing so very often soothes our grief. But human emotion is such that if anyone has something very much at heart, he supposes it is known to everyone and is equally troubling to everyone. Out of such a feeling one of the disciples, whose name was Cleopas,[23] said in reply, 'It's something quite well known to all the people in Jerusalem; since you are coming from that city just as we are, how can it be that you alone like a newly-arrived visitor[24] do not know what was done there these last few days, things that every man alive knows?' To that, as if he wanted to learn though he had in fact come to teach, Jesus answered, 'Well, what are those things?' They explained the gist of the matter to him simply, as if he were a visitor and unaware of what had happened, unselfconsciously disclosing how they still understood nothing about Jesus worthy

* * * * *

21 *confabulationes bonorum morum corruptrices*. Cf 1 Cor 15:33 and *Adagia* I x 74: *Corrumpunt mores bonos colloquia prava*, translated in CWE 31 267 as 'Evil communications corrupt good manners,' and already used in chapter 15, in the paraphrases on verses 2 and 13 (70 and 76 above).

22 Erasmus paraphrases in line with his annotation *et estis tristes* (on 24:17), where he had said that the Greek word translated *tristes* 'sad' refers to the expression on one's face, not one's state of mind.

23 So the name is spelled here in LB and the four lifetime editions used by CWE; see the Translator's Note. But the censures of the Paris faculty of theology to which Erasmus replied in his *Declarationes* (1532) included a criticism of him for using the spelling 'Cleophas' here though the accepted use of the church was 'Cleopas.' (The spelling objected to appears in the paraphrase on John 19:25.) Erasmus said that he used either spelling indifferently; perhaps it was a secretary's error. The real error, he said, was in the censure of such a point (LB IX 877B–C).

24 *novus hospes*, more literally 'new guest.' In the annotation *peregrinus es* (on 24:18) Erasmus says that the Greek verb παροικεῖς means 'you are a new arrival' (*advena*). In the paraphrase he uses a different expression to convey a similar implication: a temporary and recent resident, not a citizen.

of his true status and how they had cast off almost all hope of the resurrection.

'We were talking about Jesus of Nazareth,' they said, 'who was a remarkable man and a mighty prophet in both word and deed, not only with God, to whom he was very dear, but also with the entire populace, in whose eyes he had earned himself the highest authority by his miracles, his teaching, and his good deeds. The chief priests and the leaders of our people prosecuted him on a capital charge before the governor and finally condemned him to the cross. We had formed an extraordinary hope about him, that he was going to redeem the people of Israel – we were convinced he was the Messiah long since promised by the prophets. But his undeniable death and the shameful way he died have taken this hope away from us. Why, some hope had even been occasioned that after three days he would come back to life. But from the time when he was condemned, crucified, and buried, this is the third daybreak from all those events, and there is not a glimmer of more definite hope, except that some women from the company of his disciples made us even more astounded with a strange and unheard-of report: they had gone to the tomb before sunrise and they say that they did not find his body, and furthermore that angels appeared to them and said that he is alive. Since no one had faith in the women's story, some of our number went off to the tomb to test whether their story had any truth in it. They discovered that as far as the tomb was concerned, it was as the women had said. For they found it open and empty, and the grave-clothes and other wrappings from the corpse laid back in the tomb. But nowhere did they find him himself.'

When the disciples had guilelessly made clear in this account how they wavered in their heart, how small a hope they had in the Lord's promises, Jesus did not yet actually allow himself to be recognized, but like some more learned disciple of Jesus he scolded their slowness and rebuked their unbelief. 'O too little amenable to understanding the Scriptures,' he said, 'slow of heart and resistant to believing the many oracles that the prophets uttered about Jesus! Why do these things seem strange to you now, after they have happened, when the sayings of the prophets foretold so many generations ago that all this must happen? Why don't you compare their predictions with what has happened? Don't the Scriptures, which have been produced under heavenly inspiration, teach that it seemed best to the divine purpose for Christ to suffer all that he has suffered and thus in a revolutionary fashion restore life by way of death, claim a kingdom by way of the cross, enter into his glory by way of shame?

'This world has its glory, neither real nor lasting. Those who obtain it do so by empty pedigrees, titles, riches, lavishness, pride, the clamour of

life; sometimes they even extort it from the unwilling.[25] But by far different methods will Christ claim for himself among humankind his own glory, which he had before the creation of the world, so that he may show to all mortals the road by which they are to proceed to true and undying glory. Moses has taught so much about this, the prophets have made so many predictions, and are you still so thickheaded that you are looking for a general as a Messiah, seizing a worldly kingdom for himself with chariots, horses, elephants, armoured troops, ballistas, catapults, tortoises, onagers, fire, sword, and bloodshed?[26] Or do you not yet understand that Scripture is spiritual, and that the might of the Messiah does not consist in the resources with which the princes of this world either claim or expand their kingdom, but in heavenly power? Why do you not rather search the Scriptures, which have already foretold many things about Christ, and compare them with the things Christ himself foretold to his disciples about himself, things that have come to pass as he foretold? That way nothing will seem strange in what has happened and there will be nothing for you to distrust in what he promised for the future.'

When the Lord had made them more attentive with this bit of scolding, he explained to them all the scriptures that plainly foretold that what had now happened would come to pass in Christ. He showed them that there was such a quantity of harmonious prophecies, figures, and actual events that it would be a sign of outstanding stupidity not to notice them, or of remarkable distrust not to believe them. What is more, he began his discourse[27] with Moses and the prophets; after them he selected something from every book of divine Scripture that would build up their faith in what had happened and lay a foundation of faith in what would take place thereafter.[28] And he compared all these passages with one another in such a way that the matter was perfectly clear.

Blessed are they who have earned the privilege of hearing the heavenly teacher explicating what he had earlier made known through prophets

* * * * *

25 Cf the paraphrase on 22:25.

26 Ballistas, catapults, and onagers (*ballistae, catapultae, onagri*) specify three kinds of Roman wheeled artillery for throwing rocks and arrows; tortoises (*testudines*) were sheds or interlocked shields held overhead by soldiers in formation. All were used in siege operations. See the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* under 'artillery' and any Latin dictionary under *testudo*.

27 'Discourse' is *sermo*. See the indexes to this and other *Paraphrase* volumes for the role of this word in Erasmus' christology. Cf also n29 below.

28 Nicholas of Lyra (on 24:27) says that Jesus did not give all the passages, for time did not allow, but did include a sample of each type, like the animals in Noah's ark.

inspired by his own Spirit! Since we cannot include everything, we will repeat selected parts of that blessed talk.[29] If only the Jews would heed it even now, and stop looking for another Messiah but instead embrace with devout zeal the one who has been given to the world to be its only saviour and redeemer! If only they would be saved; if only they would be freed, if not from Caesar's power then surely, what is more blessed, from the tyranny of the devil; if only they with their commander[30] would attain to the kingdom, not of this world, which is transitory, but the heavenly one that knows no end!

This is what he said:[31]

The Jews honour Moses almost as a god because he led the people of Israel out of Egypt, and in the desert he gave the Law for them to observe and thus obtain salvation and come into a land flowing with milk and honey. Yet what else was that Moses than a foreshadowing of the Christ to come? For he was not the Son of God; he was a slave. And he did not truly set his people free, since they later were slaves to the king of Babylon. Nor was

* * * * *

29 'Talk' is *confabulatio*; see n16 above.

30 *dux*, the same word translated as 'general' two paragraphs above. The reference is to their true commander and Messiah.

31 What follows is a long declamation (to 270) delivered by Jesus amplifying Luke's laconic words, 'And beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.' It will be printed here without continuing quotation marks. The quotations or near-quotations from the Vulgate Scripture are translated, in most cases, from Erasmus' text with guidance especially from the RSV and DV equivalents. Chapter and verse numbers, as usual, follow RSV, including the Psalms references. Except where noted, Erasmus' Psalm quotations are from the 'Gallican' version, the one translated into Latin from the Septuagint, though in details his text may be different from later Vulgates. A comprehensive record of the differences between Erasmus' scriptural texts and the Vulgate is left to the forthcoming ASD edition of the *Paraphrases*. The lifetime editions include in the margins of chapter 24 some book and chapter references to Scripture, and those are further extended, though without being exhaustive, in LB.

There seems to be nothing parallel to this declamation in the traditional exegesis of the Gospel of Luke, whether commentary or sermon series; in less than a page, for example, Theophylact cites a handful of passages from the Pentateuch, Psalms, and Isaiah, and says that many more passages can be found in the prophetic books (*Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1117B–1120A). Instead the nearest comparisons are to be found in the apologetic literature of the early church, though the apologists tend to address either Jewish or pagan audiences, both presumably hostile to the message. In general the apologetic literature draws on a common core of prophetic passages and typological interpretations of

he himself entirely without sin. He did not even enter the land to which he led his people. Nor would it have mattered if he had entered it, since even today idolaters live in that same land. All these things, understood according to the flesh, have no importance.

But Christ is the true Moses, who by means of his own power frees not only the Hebrews but also all the nations who trust in him. He frees them from the vengeance of God, he frees them from the tyranny of the devil, he frees them from the darkness of error, he frees them from shameful enslavement to sin. And when they have been washed in his blood he leads them forth into the freedom of the Spirit, himself being their constant leader and companion, until he leads them through all the changes and chances of this life to the heavenly land, overflowing with every sort of blessedness. He brought the law of the Spirit and of the gospel, a law that would not deliver physical righteousness by ceremonies and animal sacrifices but would bestow true and perfect righteousness through faith and love.

Moses himself foretold that such a one would arise. For so he says in Deuteronomy: 'The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from your nation and from your brethren; heed him' [18:15]. Shortly

* * * * *

Old Testament material, though the number of passages and the intricacy of the interpretation vary greatly. The foundation is the set of passages from the Old Testament quoted in the New. Many modern Bibles include a representative selection of such corresponding passages as marginalia or 'concordances.' In the *Ratio verae theologiae* LB V 91C–D Erasmus had praised the fourth book of Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem* for matching the consensus of prophecy to the teachings of Christ; in that part of the work Tertullian discusses the Marcionite gospel, which is a curtailed form of the Gospel of Luke. *Adversus Marcionem* 3, on the other hand, takes Old Testament prophecies of Christ as its focus. Similarly Cyprian's *Ad Quirinum testimonia* (addressed to a believer, not a Jew or pagan) collects Old Testament prophecies in its first book, followed by a second that focuses on aspects of the New Testament Jesus and how he is foretold literally or typologically in the Old. In 1519–20 Erasmus had edited the works of Cyprian for the Froben press; cf Ep 1000. In 1521 Froben published the first edition of Tertullian, prepared by Erasmus' friend and colleague Beatus Rhenanus; cf Ep 1232. The declamation here falls into two similar parts: first Old Testament prophecy, as suggested by the evangelist's own words, and then a comparison of Jesus' life as reported in the Gospels to the signs and types in the Old Testament. Perhaps his recent attention to two important Latin apologists spurred Erasmus to try his own hand at an apologetic exercise in a similar vein. For further discussion see Jane E. Phillips 'On the Road to Emmaus: Erasmus' Paraphrase of Luke 24:27' ERSY 22 (2002) 68–80.

thereafter the Lord confirms the promise to Moses, saying, 'I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brethren, and I will put my words in his mouth, and he will say to them everything that I have taught him' [18:18].

There you have the prophecy to Moses; now compare the actual fact. No one has arisen after Moses who could in any way equal him in authority except Jesus Christ alone, who reflects Moses only to surpass him in every way. He was the establisher of a new, and an everlasting, covenant. He sanctified it not with the blood of a calf but with his own blood. He was the establisher of a new law, and one that brings complete salvation. Moses was a servant; this one was the Son, who came down from heaven and taught the things that he saw in his Father's house, and had in himself the unceasing power to do whatever he wanted. Moses spoke with God on the mountain, in the cloud; Christ proceeded[32] from the light of his Father. Moses delivered to you shadows of things; Christ delivered the truth. Moses interceded for the sins of the people only to be himself also in need of an intercessor for his own misdeeds; Christ, being free from every sin, expiated the sins of all ages. Moses fasted for forty days; Christ did the same, so that even in this sign you might recognize the second Moses. Moses brought the Law from the mountain; Christ on the mountain taught the dissolution of the Law, declaring those new and unheard-of beatitudes.[33] He also often taught in the temple, which is located on Mt Zion, that is, in accordance with the prophecy of Isaiah that says, 'Out of Zion shall the law go forth, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.'[34]

But when the law of Moses was established, everything was filled with threats, because of the need to pound down the people's hardness of heart. Christ came gentle and lovable rather than fearsome, proving by his logic, inviting by his good deeds, enticing by his mildness, accessible and open to every person in order to bestow salvation, conquering by forbearance. And

* * * * *

32 'Proceeded' is *processit*. In *1523* the wording was *numquam recessit* 'never withdrew'; in *1524* 'never' was omitted; and in *1534*, *1535*, and LB *processit* replaced *recessit*.

33 In various places the New Testament presents Moses as the (flawed) predecessor, type, and prophet of the perfection realized in Christ. See such passages as John 1:17, 5:45–7, and 6:30–51, Luke 16:29 and 31, Matt 5:1–48 and 19:1–9 (with Mark 10:2–12), Acts 3:22–3 and 7:17–53, 2 Cor 3:7–18, and Hebrews generally. Erasmus had made the same point early in this *Paraphrase*, at the end of chapter 3 (LB VII 317F–318A), and it is common in the apologists; cf n31 above.

34 Isa 2:3, but Erasmus has *sermo* for the *verbum* in the Vulgate. Cf n27 above and n55 below.

such the oracles of the prophets had promised he would be. For you have read what Isaiah wrote: 'I have put my spirit upon him; he will bring forth justice among the nations. He will not cry out or show partiality, nor will his voice be heard in the streets. The bruised reed he will not crush and the smoking wick he will not quench. In truth will he lead forth justice; he will not be harsh or violent till he has set justice on the earth, and the islands will wait for his law' [42:1b–4]. Again in another place Isaiah also makes the Messiah say, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me, he has sent me that I might preach to the meek, bind up the broken-hearted, and proclaim liberty to captives and release to the imprisoned, and that I might proclaim the year acceptable to the Lord and the day of vengeance for our God, and comfort all who mourn, and put courage in those who mourn in Zion, and give them a crown instead of ashes, the oil of gladness instead of mourning, and the mantle of praise instead of the spirit of grief' [61:1–3]. You have heard what kind of a Messiah prophecy foretold. Now consider in your hearts whether such a one has not come. What sex, what age, what condition did he separate from his good deeds? Not children, not women, not tax collectors, not sinners, not whores. What kind of disease did he abhor? Not lepers, not the demon-possessed, not those subject to haemorrhage, not paralytics. What was gentler than the saying you heard from him, 'Come to me, all you who labour and are heavy-laden, and I will refresh you, for my yoke is easy and my burden light. Learn from me, because I am gentle and lowly in heart, and you will find rest for your souls' [Matt 11:28–30]? What mother ever so loved her children, so put up with them, so cherished them, as he did his disciples?[35] And in addition, the law of Moses was given neither to all peoples nor for all ages. The law of Christ not only has been brought forth for all nations but also will not be altered in any age from now till the end of the world.

Consider here too how everything is consistent: first, how clearly Jeremiah prophesied to you that circumcision of the body would come to an end, together with animal sacrifices, sabbaths, keeping special days, dietary restrictions, fasts, vows, and the other ceremonies given for a time so that the thickheaded Jews would have figures of spiritual things. 'Break up your fallow ground,' he said, 'and do not sow over thorns; be circumcised for the Lord and remove the foreskin of your hearts, men of Judah and dwellers in Jerusalem' [4:3–4]. Again in another place the same prophet says, 'Behold, the days will come, says the Lord, and I will make a

* * * * *

35 Cf Num 11:12–14, Isa 66:12–13, Luke 13:34, Matt 23:37, and the paraphrase on Luke 23:29.

new agreement for the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not like the covenant I made with your fathers' [31:31–2]. Then he adds a clear distinction between the harsh and unbearable Law, which was rightly written on stones representing in their hardness Jewish hard-heartedness, and the law of the gospel, whereby innocence through faith is freely offered: 'This will be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel. After those days, says the Lord, I will put my law in their vitals and write it on their hearts' [31:33]. Then he declares that the shadows of the Law will come to an end when the light of truth has been brought forth: 'And no longer shall each man teach his neighbour and each his brother, saying, "Know the Lord." For they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the Lord, because I will forgive their iniquity and I will remember their sin no more' [31:34].

Do you not remember Christ saying and doing things consistent with this while he was still living? Did he not openly announce the end of the old Law when he said, 'The Law and the prophets [prophesied] until John'?[36] The Jews worshipped at Jerusalem. But what did he say to the Samaritan woman? 'The time will come, and is now near, when they will worship the Father neither in Jerusalem nor on this mountain, but they will worship him in spirit.'[37] Did he not begin to abrogate the Law implicitly when he healed on the sabbath though the Pharisees vainly raised loud objections, when he supported his disciples plucking ears of grain on the sabbath in the face of the Pharisees' slander, when he defended them against the Pharisees' slanderous accusation that they did not fast?[38] But much more so when he healed the leper without ceremonies, and touched one condemned by the priests because of leprosy, an act that the Law forbids; when without the remedy of the Law he forgave the sins of the paralytic, of the sinful woman who broke in on the banquet, and of several others? For the Law had commanded burnt offerings to be made for sins and the commission of wrong to be expiated by specified animal sacrifices and gifts. But Christ the renewer of the old Law substituted love for the burnt offering; he said, 'Her many sins are forgiven her, because she has loved much.' He

* * * * *

36 Matt 11:13; the verb is omitted in Erasmus' text, as also in the version at 16:16.

37 An approximate quotation of John 4:23. Erasmus substitutes 'time' for 'hour' and 'is near' for 'is.' He omits 'true worshippers' and 'in truth' after 'in spirit,' and adds 'neither in Jerusalem nor on this mountain.' Cf the paraphrase on this verse, which has a longer version of the same addition, CWE 46 58.

38 Healing is reported in many places; for plucking grain, Matt 12:1–2, Mark 2:23–4; for not fasting, 5:33–5.

substituted faith for sacrifices, saying, 'Have faith, my son, your sins are forgiven you.'[39] Why, even more clearly on one occasion he distinguished for you the difference between the two laws, when he forbade divorce, which the law of Moses had conceded; when he prohibited oath taking, which the earlier Law had not prohibited; when he bade you love even your enemies, though the old Law permitted you both to hate and to take vengeance on an enemy.[40] Did he not once cancel all the authority of the priests, scribes, and Pharisees, who still held tenaciously to their crude Law? 'Let them be,' he said; 'they are the blind leading the blind' [Matt 15:14].

Had not the prophets predicted this also, that the things of the flesh would give way to the things of the spirit? Do you not remember what the prophet Daniel wrote? 'So that transgression may be finished and sin ended and iniquity obliterated, and everlasting righteousness brought in, and vision and prophecy fulfilled, and the holy of holies be anointed' [9:24]. When you hear that prophecies are finished, of course you understand that the things that have been fulfilled are not to be expected any longer. When you hear everlasting righteousness you understand that the temporal righteousness of the Law has been abrogated. When you hear that the Messiah, who is the holy of holies, alone making all things holy, is to be anointed, surely you understand that physical anointing will come to an end and the priesthood of the Law with its animal sacrifices is to be rejected. For Jesus was never anointed with the holy ointment that the Law scrupulously

* * * * *

39 For the leper and the laws on leprosy see 5:12–16 and Leviticus 13; for the sinful woman and the laws about sin offerings, 7:36–50 (quoting 7:47) and Leviticus 4–6; for the paralytic, 5:17–26 (but the quotation is from Matt 9:2).

40 The occasion is the sermon on the mount (or plain); cf Matthew 5–7, Luke 6:20–49. For divorce, cf Matt 5:31–2 and 19:3–9; on oath-taking, Matt 5:33–7; on loving your enemies, 6:27–36, Matt 5:38–42.
Béda and the Paris faculty of theology censured the bald statement that oath-taking was prohibited in the new Law, on the grounds that the same moral principles are found in both the old and the new Law. Erasmus replied in the *Declarationes* LB IX 837F–838E that the approved Doctors of the church had consistently taught that the new Law abrogated the old in its outward details – types and ceremonies in particular – though not the old Law spiritually interpreted, which Christ completed. So here, he says, it was wrong for the Paris theologians to have described what he said as a 'bald prohibition' (*simpliciter prohibitum*). He had defended himself to the same effect earlier in the *Divinationes* LB IX 493E–494A. The same opponents also objected to the assertion here that the old Law permitted both hatred of an enemy and vengeance on him. In the *Divinationes* Erasmus claimed that he was speaking more of the tone of the Law and its harsh interpretation by the Pharisees (494A).

prescribed to be made, threatening death to those who copied its composition or turned it to secular uses.[41] For anointing the body does not produce priestliness, except that it was a sign of the spiritual anointing with which Christ was anointed: as I just now repeated from the prophecy, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me' [Isa 61:1]. The psalmist was in agreement, saying of the Messiah, 'Therefore has God, your God, anointed you with the oil of gladness above your fellows' [45:7]. What the prophet promised you saw fulfilled when Jesus was baptized in the Jordan. For the Spirit in visible form descended on his head, and the voice of the Father was heard, who had anointed his Son with the oil of gladness above the prophets and patriarchs, indeed above all mortals who ever were or are or are to be.

This heavenly and spiritual anointing put an end to the Mosaic priesthood, as Daniel soon adds: 'And in the middle of the week offering and sacrifice will cease' [9:27]. God meant much the same thing when, as though disdaining their animal sacrifices, he said through Isaiah, 'What is the multitude of your sacrifices to me? says the Lord. I am full. I do not want burnt offerings of rams and the fat of sleek beasts and the blood of calves and lambs and goats' [1:11]. Has not Daniel already plainly foretold the overthrow of the city of Jerusalem with its temple? Did not Christ prophesy the same thing to his disciples, with welling tears weeping over the downfall of the city and its people?[42] For it was already displeasing to God, who is Spirit, to dwell in a temple made by human hands; he took no delight in sacrifices of cattle.[43] He desired another city, for which the name Jerusalem would be truly fitting; another temple worthy of him, founded by him, consecrated by his Spirit; other sacrifices, another nation circumcised in heart, a nation that the name of Israel would truly suit.[44]

Furthermore, nothing that is visible to the body's eyes lasts forever; the things that are not seen are eternal, and on that account worthy of God, who is eternity itself. Even so these shadows of visible things are given for a time to an unschooled and thickheaded people so that in time they may

* * * * *

41 Cf Exod 30:22–33.

42 Cf the prophecies in Daniel 9, 11, and 12. Christ's prophecy is at 19:41–4 and its synoptic parallels.

43 For the temple made without hands, cf Mark 14:58. Various passages besides the Isaiah just quoted describe God's displeasure with sacrifices, eg Ps 50:8–13, Hos 6:6.

44 Jerome *De nominibus Hebraicis* CCL 72 in several places defines 'Jerusalem' as 'vision of peace' and 'Israel' as '(a man) seeing God.' For the circumcision of the heart, cf eg Jer 4:4, quoted above, and Rom 2:29.

advance through these first lessons to the things of the heart. But he who disdained the old Law's city and temple and people and sacrifices makes clear enough in the prophets what kind he wants afterwards. Or have you not read what Isaiah wrote of the spiritual Jerusalem? 'Hereafter,' he says, 'you shall be called the city of the righteous one, the faithful city; Zion shall be redeemed in judgment, and they shall lead her back in righteousness' [1:26–7].[45] You hear of a new structure for the city, which is the church, constructed of living stones, whose cornerstone and foundation is Christ himself.[46] The prophecy of a mystical psalm described this stone: 'The stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner' [118:22], and you have heard Christ himself using the witness of this scripture to counter the Pharisees who were trying to reject the stone that God had chosen.[47] Another prophet also remembers this: 'I will lay for a foundation in Zion a stone, a tested stone, a cornerstone, precious, fixed in the foundation' [Isa 28:16]. And did not Christ's words while he lived agree with this prophecy? He put to you the parable about the house built on solid rock, which no force of winds or waves could tear from its place, describing, of course, himself as the foundation of the church, against whom even the gates of hell do not prevail, as he once promised to his disciple Peter.[48]

* * * * *

45 Erasmus' explication of the Isaiah quotation in the second next paragraph (ending 'do not believe them') has guided this translation of the Vulgate text. The difficult terms are these: *Iusti* in *urbis iusti*, here 'city of the righteous one' ('of the just' DV, 'of righteousness' RSV). Erasmus repeats this part of the quotation below and continues, 'But no one of humankind except Christ ... could be called righteous.' Since individual humans except Christ are excluded, and Christ as an individual human is cited, Erasmus seems to take *iusti* as an individual person. Cf also Acts 3:14, 22:14, and the paraphrases on those passages in CWE 50. *In iudicio*, here 'in judgment' ('in judgment' DV, 'in justice' RSV). The allusive quotation (below) of this clause is followed by 'For God does not judge,' *iudicat*, the verb of which *iudicium* is the related noun; Erasmus is exploiting the etymology. *In iustitiam*, here 'in righteousness' ('in righteousness' RSV, 'in justice' DV). Here, as broadly in this translation, 'righteousness' and 'righteous' are preferred over 'justice' and 'just' for divine justice rather than the justice of human communal life. See the indexes of Greek and Latin words or of theological terms in other CWE volumes for these words. For careful discussion of Erasmus' use of them see Robert Dick Sider 'The Just and the Holy in Erasmus' New Testament Scholarship' ERSY 11 (1991) 1–26.

46 Cf 1 Pet 2:5, Eph 2:20–2.

47 Cf 20:17.

48 For the parable see 6:47–9 (but the winds are mentioned in the version at Matt 7:24–7); for the promise to Peter about the gates of hell, Matt 16:18.

Solomon built the temple at Jerusalem according to what Moses had been commanded. But as that peacemaking king bore the image of the Messiah who has mended the everlasting peace between God and humankind, so the temple built by human workmanship was a figure of the temple whose builder was Christ himself.[49] Thus the Lord once said to David through Nathan, as you read in the second book of Kings: 'You will not build me a house to dwell in, but I shall raise up your seed after you, who will come forth from your womb; he will build a house for my name, and I will establish his throne forever.'[50] What was said by the prophet does not fit Solomon, as is plainly shown even by the fact that foreigners now sit on the throne of Solomon, and in a short while the whole race of the Jews is to be scattered among the nations. The house that Solomon built in Jerusalem was bustling and noisy with butcherings, smoke from burnt offerings, ritual bathing, and incense burning. But the house that Christ has built is made agreeable by the invisible faith that knows no limit. For so the prophet says in the same place: 'And your house and your kingdom shall be faithful forever before my face, and your throne shall be everlastingly sure.'[51] These promises are utterly vain if they are understood literally about Solomon or David. For David besmirched his kingship with adultery combined with murder, and Solomon was dragged to the point of idol worship by his passions for women.[52]

Now reflect how the words of Nathan agree with the words of Isaiah, who said, 'You shall be called the city of the righteous one, the faithful city' [1:26]. But no one of humankind except Christ has existed who could be called righteous without qualification: not only free from all stain of sin but also such that through him everyone might be made righteous. What does Christ require from his own, if not faith? For that reason he called his church, which knows nothing of the works of the Law, the faithful city, depending entirely on him alone. When you hear that this city is to be redeemed in judgment, you see that reliance on the ceremonies of the Law has been removed. For God does not judge by works but by faith, not

* * * * *

49 Jerome *De nominibus Hebraicis* CCL 72 138 and 148 defines 'Solomon' as 'peacemaker' or 'he will be pacified.' For Christ as peace, cf Eph 2:14–15, Col 1:20.

50 2 Sam 7:5, 12, 13; 1 Kings 8:19.

51 2 Sam 7:16. For Erasmus' 'before my face' the Vulgate and DV say *ante faciem tuam* 'before thy face'; LXX and RSV have 'before me.'

52 For David's murder and adultery see 2 Sam 11; for Solomon's offences, 1 Kings 11. Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.20.8–9 says that Solomon cannot be the one to 'come forth from [David's] womb' since David did not give birth to him, and that Solomon roused God's anger by his lustfulness and idolatry.

by food or drink, not by dress or keeping the sabbath, but by godliness of heart.[53] And this is judgment: that those who have believed in Christ will be redeemed from their sins through the death of him who paid the penalty for all, and will be made righteous through his righteousness as they follow in the footsteps of their prince. You have a spiritual city and temple, which cannot be pointed to by fingers, and just so neither can its king and builder himself, as he himself said when he was alive. 'When they say, "Look, Christ is here; look, he is there," do not believe them.'[54]

The Jews glory in Mt Zion, which holds up the temple; hereafter there will be a spiritual Zion, lifting up the hearts of believers from lust for earthly things to zeal for heavenly things. Isaiah prophesied to you about this, saying, 'And in the last days the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established on the top of the mountains, and it shall be raised above all hills. And all nations shall stream to it, and many peoples shall go and say, Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us his ways and we will walk in his paths, because the law shall go forth out of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem' [2:2–3].[55] David also was often mindful of this spiritual mountain: 'They that trust in the Lord are like Mt Zion: he who dwells in Jerusalem shall forever be unmoved.'[56]

Concerning this temple, in which the Jews now take pride but which is soon to be destroyed, Christ also made a prophecy; he said, 'Your house shall be left desolate' [Matt 23:38]. And God had earlier warned Solomon that that would happen, as you read in the third book of Kings: 'And the temple that I have sanctified for my name I will cast forth from my sight,

* * * * *

53 Béda and the Paris faculty of theology censured this passage, chiefly the sentence 'What does Christ require from his own, if not faith?' along with two from the *Paraphrase on John* (on John 4:21 and 8:51) because they seemed to assert a Lutheranizing 'faith alone' theme. Erasmus replied in the *Divinationes* LB IX 494B–C that his comment excluded not works of piety, providing they proceed from faith, but the ritual works demanded by the old Law. He restated his position, with some resentment, in the *Supputatio* LB IX 620D–621E. In the *Declarationes* LB IX 847A–849D he said that in all the *Paraphrases* he had endeavoured to show that a profession of faith was not sufficient unless accompanied by a life in accordance with it. See also CWE 46 57 n40 and 118 n75.

54 Cf Mark 13:21 and the parallels at 17:23 and Matt 24:23.

55 Verse 3 has already been quoted above. This time Erasmus retains the *verbum* of the Vulgate text; cf n34 above.

56 Ps 125:1–2, reading 'in Jerusalem' of the Vulgate text as part of the sentence in verse 1

and Israel will be a proverb and a byword for all the peoples, and this house will be a warning. Everyone who passes by it will be astonished and will hiss and say, "Why has the Lord acted so to this land and this house?" And they will reply, "Because they forsook the Lord their God."'[57] For this is the house, the rebellious one,[58] with whom, according to the prophets, God quarrelled so many times, who has gone so far in her rebellion from her God that she nailed his only Son to the cross.

Why, the prophet even promises in place of the unspiritual and stiff-necked people a people who are peaceful and obedient to the point of death. For so says Isaiah: 'And they shall forge their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation and they shall not train for war any more. House of Jacob, come, let us walk in the light of our God' [2:4–5]. Do not the promises of Christ harmonize with these, when he promised that he would raise sons of Abraham from the stones, and when he called himself the light of the world and said that whoever followed him would not walk in darkness, and when he flung at them the prophecy of Isaiah, 'This people honours me with its lips but its heart is far from me'?[59] What is more, through Hosea he promises himself a new people, a people that does not boast of its own works but acknowledges the mercy of God: 'And in the place where it is said to them, you are not my people, it shall be said to them, sons of the living God' [1:10]. And again, 'And I will have pity on her who was without pity' [2:23], meaning the people of the gentiles, who though till now they have served idols will soon receive the gospel teaching rejected by the Jews. The psalmist also prophesied about the gentiles: 'A people whom I do not know have served me, at the ear's hearing they have obeyed me' [18:43–4]. Did not Christ's statement agree with this prophecy, when he said, 'And I have other sheep, which are not of this fold, and I must bring them also' [John 10:16]?

Indeed, a renewed priesthood and a renewed kingdom renews all things. And the sayings of the prophets had promised a new priest. For so the mystic psalm has it: 'The Lord has sworn and will not repent, "You are a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek"' [110:4]. Melchizedek was priest and king: priest of the most high God, for he was not appointed in accordance with the Law; as king of Salem, that is, king of peace, he

* * * * *

57 Exactly quoted from 1 Kings 9:7–9, though *1523* and *1524* had *significavi* 'marked' for *sanctificavi* 'sanctified'

58 *exasperatrix*, as in Ezek 2:8 Vulg

59 Cf 3:8 (but the Baptist is the speaker, not Christ), John 8:12, and Mark 7:6, approximately quoting Isa 29:13.

symbolized Christ, who has no beginning and will have no end.[60] Not through the blood of calves or goats but through his own blood Christ enters the holy of holies, to intercede for the sins of the whole world.[61] He carried out this sacrifice on the altar of the cross, offering himself as the purest victim to God his Father. Surely this is the priest that God had once promised to Eli as he lay dying; he said, 'I will raise up for myself a faithful priest, who shall do according to my heart and mind, and I will build for him a faithful house, and he shall walk before my anointed ones[62] all his days' [1 Sam 2:35]. Surely this is what Christ himself promised to you: 'I am with you until the close of the age' [Matt 28:20].

Now the prophet did not keep silence about the type of sacrifice that would follow in place of the slaughtering of animals by priests of the Law. For the inspired psalmist said, 'Sacrifice to God the sacrifice of praise, and pay your vows to the Most High; call on me in the day of tribulation and I will deliver, and you shall glorify me' [50:14–15]. Again in the same place: 'The sacrifice of praise shall honour me'; and again there also: 'That I may show him the salvation of God' [50:23].[63] And elsewhere: 'Make the sacrifice

* * * * *

60 Cf Gen 14:18, Heb 7:1–3. 'Salem' means 'peace'; see Jerome *De nominibus Hebraicis* CCL 72 72 and 157.

61 As far as 'his own blood' (and with the goats and calves in reverse order), this is a quotation of Heb 9:12. The rest is a paraphrase on the remainder of that verse, and perhaps also of Heb 2:17, 10:12–14, and 1 John 2:2; or it may be mostly influenced by liturgical language.

62 *christis meis*, plural, though in the LXX and Vulgate the phrase is *christo meo* 'my anointed one.' Generally in 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings the anointed one is the king, as probably most often (on the literal level) in Psalms. In the Pentateuch it refers to priests. 'The anointed one' or 'messiah' becomes ὁ χρίστος in Greek, hence 'Christ'; cf 4:18–21, Acts 4:27 and 10:38, and the appearances of 'Christ' in the Gospels. In using a plural here, Erasmus may have in mind 2 Cor 1:21 *qui unxit nos Deus* 'God who has anointed us,' where Paul means by 'us' at least himself, Silvanus, and Timothy. But as Erasmus paraphrases it, more likely the reference is to all believers: 'So that we might have more confidence in his promises [God] has anointed us with his secret gifts and impressed a kind of seal on our minds, and even put his Spirit into our hearts, as warrant and pledge of the promised bliss hereafter' (LB VII 917C–D). In the Luke paraphrase the next sentence suggests that 'all believers' is what 'my anointed ones' means here too. Note also in the second next paragraph, the sacrifice of Christ's body 'so that it would thereafter be consumed spiritually by his anointed' (*christis ipsius*), a sacrifice by 'new priests whom God has anointed' (*quos unxit Deus*). See Erasmus' own treatment of 'anointed' in his commentary on Ps 2 (1522) CWE 63 88.

63 Two separate bits quoted from Ps 50:23, divided by an authorial *et illic iterum* 'and again there also,' followed by *ut* for the Vulgate *quod* (or *quo*) 'that.' So

of righteousness, and hope in the Lord' [4:5]. You have heard of the triple sacrifice: of prayers or vows, about which Christ taught you: 'Whatever you ask my Father in my name, he will give you' [John 15:16]; of praise, which it is common knowledge that he regularly carried out, giving frequent thanks to the Father; of righteousness, which offers the power of life to the innocent[64] and services of love to the one in need. He himself offered you a perfect model of righteousness, expending his life to save his sheep, being found the only one among humankind in whom there was no guile.[65] He taught this too from the prophet, saying, 'Go and learn what this means: "I desire mercy and not sacrifice"' [Matt 9:13].

Hence in the spiritual temple, under Christ the high priest, no longer will a public distribution be put on of flesh from calves, goats, or sheep, but of the precious body and blood of Jesus Christ, which he sacrificed once and for all, so that it could thereafter be consumed spiritually by his anointed,[66] who through their thankful commemoration in a way renew for themselves the death of their high priest. This surely is the sacrifice that soon will be offered all over the world by new priests whom God has anointed, a sacrifice about which Malachi prophesied: 'I have no pleasure in you, says the Lord of hosts, and I will not accept an offering from your hand. For from the rising of the sun to its setting my name is great among the nations, and in every place a sacrifice and pure offering is offered to my name' [1:10–11]. This is what was prophesied also to Eli the priest, that whoever would come into the new temple would say, 'Put me, I pray you, into one of the priest's places, that I may eat a morsel' [1 Sam 2:36]. This is the sacrifice that Christ gave to his disciples at the paschal meal, offering them bread that he said was his body and a cup that he said was the cup of his blood, by which he consecrated for them a new covenant, that is, a

* * * * *

the text appears in the *Paraphrase* from *1524* on, including LB. But the *1523* text reads a version closer to the entire Vulgate sentence: *Sacrificium laudis honorificabit me, et illic iter ut ostendam illi salutare Dei* 'the sacrifice of praise will honour me and there will be the path that I may show him the salvation of God.' It would appear that the noun *iter* 'path' later became the abbreviated form of *iterum* 'again,' perhaps affected by Erasmus' use of *ut* immediately following *iter*. In any case the punctuation in the editions after the first one confirms the later version translated here.

64 *innocenti vim vitae* in *1523*, *1524*, *1534*, *1535*, and LB VII 474C, though LB notes a slightly different reading, *innocentiam vitae* 'innocence of life' in another edition

65 Cf John 10:15 and 1 Peter 2:22, quoting Isa 53:9.

66 For *christis ipsius* and, in the next sentence, 'whom God has anointed' (*quos unxit Deus*) see n62 above.

bond of undying friendship.[67] If you yourselves did not see these things, you certainly could have heard of them from the twelve, through whom he desired that what has taken place would reach everyone.

As Christ, coming from heaven, turned all fleshly things into spiritual, the city, the temple, the priesthood, the sacrifices, so he also desired the kingdom to be new, and therefore he regularly called it the kingdom of heaven, so that you would not look for something like what you see in a worldly kingdom. For though he was Lord of all, even before he came down to earth, it was still a spiritual kingdom, and in order to claim it for his Father he became obedient even to death on the cross.[68] In this way he defeated the adversary, in this way he set his people free, in this way he claimed and spread and established the kingdom for his Father. And indeed, the prophet promised the Messiah under the title of king and commander,[69] but the two titles indicate his double coming: the first, as you saw him, lowly and mild, for he came to heal, not to avenge.[70] Yet he will come at the end of the world with majesty, encompassed about with many thousands of angels, to judge the living and the dead.[71] But since he has now come lowly and mild, many are offended, so much so that even the twelve that he had chosen as most faithful of all fled in terror, and one even denied him.

Now if you carefully compared the writings of the prophets with what you have seen done, there would be no reason for you to be offended; there would be reason for you to recognize him who came and was the kind of Messiah that was promised. Consider what Zechariah says: 'Behold, your king will come to you, just and a saviour, humble and riding on an ass, and on a colt the foal of an ass' [9:9]. One who comes in this way does not come

* * * * *

67 Cf Matt 26:26–8 and Luke 22:18–20; see the paraphrase on the latter passage. Erasmus mentions the bond of friendship as a meaning of the Eucharist in the paraphrase on John 13:2 CWE 46 160. See also *Querela pacis* CWE 27 304.

68 Cf Phil 2:8.

69 *regis ducisque titulo.* This is apparently not an allusion to a particular scriptural pairing of the two terms but a synopsis of a range of prophetic passages. Cf Jerome *Commentarii in Ezechielem* PL 25 428A–430C (on Ezek 44:1–3), who compares *princeps* (in his Latin text) and *dux* (from the LXX) in that passage, suggesting that the two together are a translation of a single Hebrew word.

70 Cf John 12:47, with Matt 21:5 and its Old Testament parallels.
This and the next paragraph begin the turn in Erasmus' composition from focus on Old Testament prophecy of the Messiah to the biography of Jesus as the fulfilment of prophecy. Cf n31 above and n77 below.

71 Cf eg Matt 24:30–1 and 25:31, 2 Thess 1:7, Acts 10:42, 2 Tim 4:1, and the language of the Creeds.

to make war but to scatter the wars of the world, which are waged under the banners of Satan; for the prophet goes on, 'And I will break up the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the bow of battle shall be scattered, and he shall speak peace to the nations, and his dominion shall be from sea to sea' [9:10]. You have seen him entering Jerusalem in such a procession, intending to mock the kingdoms of the world, intending to remind you of the prophecy. Now consider whether Isaiah promised he would be any different. He says, 'For every violent pillaging in tumult and garment mixed with blood will be for burning and will be fuel for the fire. For to us a child is born, and to us a son is given, and the government has come to be upon his shoulder, and his name will be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Father of the age to come, Prince of Peace. His rule will be multiplied and of his peace there will be no end. He will sit upon the throne of David and over his kingdom, to preserve it and strengthen it in justice and righteousness' [9:5–7]. When you hear of a kingdom and a government placed upon his shoulder, are you not plainly hearing of the kingdom of the cross Christ carried as he was about to conquer the powers of the air?[72] When you hear of the Prince of Peace, surely you understand the king enticing by good deeds, not compelling by force and fear. When you hear of the Father of the age to come, you perceive that he is unlike the princes of this age. The prophet describes him just the same way in another place: 'And he shall strike the earth with the rod of his mouth and with the breath of his lips he shall slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his hips, and faithfulness the belt of his loins. The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid' [Isa 11:4–6], and so on, sounding far different from arms and wars of princes.

Now listen to what he says of himself in the mystic psalm: 'But I have been set by him as king over Zion, his holy mountain, telling of his decree' [2:6]. Did he not clearly express the kingdom of the gospel word? This is surely the sword of which the other psalm makes mention: 'Gird your sword upon your thigh, most mighty one, in your glory and your beauty direct your course, go forth prosperously and reign, because of truth and gentleness and righteousness' [45:3–4]. Who has heard of a king governing successfully by the loveliness of his body or acquiring a kingdom for himself by his gentleness? But this was the grace of the divine word, by

* * * * *

72 For the powers of the air cf Eph 6:12. Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.19.2–3 and Cyprian *Ad Quirinum testimonia* 2.21 explain that 'the government placed upon his shoulder' of Isa 9:6 is a type of Jesus carrying his cross to the crucifixion.

which you saw Jesus entice numbers of people to himself; this was the truth against which the Pharisees so often tried in vain to struggle. Such was the sword which, when he was about to die, he warned the apostles to procure for themselves, about which he had spoken on an earlier occasion, saying that he had not come to earth to bring peace but a sword. Such are also the 'sharp arrows of the mighty one' [Ps 120:4] with which he pierces the base lusts of humankind, with which he slays the greedy and rouses the doer of good deeds; with which he kills the idolater and rouses the proclaimer of gospel godliness; with which he slays the warlike and vindictive and raises up the gentle and meek; with which he lays low the proud and makes the humble stand upright.[73]

Do you want to understand the sort of kingdom? See what kind of servants and extenders of his sway he chose: insignificant, lowly, uneducated, equipped with neither wealth nor weapons nor provisions nor any of the resources of this world against the treacherous malice of the Pharisees, against the power of princes, against the arrogance of philosophers. And with these commanders he is going to defeat all the kingdoms of the world, with no other equipment than the helmet of salvation, which is a right understanding of Holy Scripture; the shield of faith, by which, with God as their protector, they will be safe from all assaults of the ungodly; with the breastplate of righteousness, woven of all the gospel virtues; with the swordbelt of chastity and the gospel footgear, which is a heart cleansed from all earthly affections. But above all with the sword of the Spirit, which is the divine word.[74]

So it seemed best to God to show his power through the weakness of his Son, to declare his wisdom through the foolishness of preaching, to

* * * * *

73 Cf 22:36–9 and the paraphrase there and Matt 10:34. Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.14.2–7 discusses the paradoxical combination of a sword and beauty describing the king prophesied in Ps 45:2–4. See the next note. In the same passage he explains 'your sharp arrows' of Ps 45:5 as the 'precepts, threats, and searchings of heart that fly everywhere, striking and piercing every conscience.' Erasmus' quotation is from Ps 120:4, as confirmed by the marginal citation of the psalm in *1534* and *1535*, but his interpretation is the same. For laying low the proud and making the humble stand upright see 1:51–3 and the paraphrase there.

74 Tertullian in the passage cited in the preceding note also connects the sword (and arrows) of Old Testament prophecy with the metaphorical armor of Eph 6:14–17 (which does not include Erasmus' 'swordbelt of chastity') and declares that the sword of the Spirit there identified by Paul as the divine word is the sword meant in the Old Testament passages.

make his glory illustrious through the shame of the cross.[75] For the present time the gospel kingdom is situated in these, until at the end of the world the majesty of Christ, all lowliness put aside, and the bliss of the godly, unstained by any afflictions, come forth. And yet this lowliness has spiritual strength, powerful and fit to cast down all the foundations[76] that raise themselves against the glory of God. Or have you ever seen anything gentler than Christ, lowlier, poorer, milder, more in favour with the people and further removed from every appearance of kingship? And yet what is more regal than with a word to cast out evil spirits, with a command to quell the winds and waves, with a touch to heal lepers, with a single order to dispel every kind of disease? How often did he escape through the midst of Jews plotting death for him? He let himself be taken, but at the sound of his voice armed guards fell to the ground. He died on the cross, but what is mightier than this death, which shattered the elements of the universe, which darkened the sun, split rocks, opened tombs, roused the dead? Nothing was more lowly than his birth, but here too evidence of his concealed sublimity flashed instantly forth. He is born of a mere girl, but by the operation of the divine Spirit. He is laid in a manger, but angels sing glory to God in the highest. A baby cries in his cradle, but Herod the king trembles and the magi adore him. These things, still not known to very many, will someday be preached throughout the whole world. With resources of this kind he will equip his apostles also.

But if you read the Scriptures closely and compare with them what you have seen and heard, you cannot doubt that he is the Christ who was promised, priest, king, and saviour of the whole world, after whom no other is to be looked for. Review, please, in your minds his whole life, which in part you saw with your own eyes, in part you were able to learn of from relatives and friends. You will find nothing that was not both prefigured in the Old Testament and predicted by the prophets.[77]

He had been promised from the stock of David and from the tribe of Judah, from the town of Bethlehem. Concerning his birthplace see whether Micah prophesied ambiguously: 'And you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah, you are little among the thousands of Judah: out of you shall come forth one who will be my ruler in Israel, and his goings forth are from the beginning, from the days of eternity.' That this would happen the scribes understood before

* * * * *

75 Cf 1 Cor 1:21–5.

76 Cf 2 Cor 10:4.

77 This and the preceding paragraph complete the transition to a comparison of Jesus' life with the Old Testament prophecies; cf nn31 and 70 above.

it did happen, for when Herod asked they replied without hesitation that the Messiah would be born in Bethlehem.[78] And it is general knowledge that Jesus was born there because of the imperial tax registration. Herod's cruelty made the fact well known.[79] But you know that he was commonly considered not a Bethlehemite but a Nazarene and Galilean, because he was brought up in Nazareth until he reached adulthood, and lived there with his parents for a long time, so long that even the signboard on the cross had the inscription 'Jesus of Nazareth.'[80] Not even that was unremarked in the prophets, who repeatedly designate him with the term 'holy' and 'holy of holies,' because he was uniquely consecrated to the Lord, not just according to the usual law about first-born males, in obedience to which he too was taken to the temple by his parents and consecrated to the Lord,[81] but also by a particular privilege above all mortals. Jacob, blind in his physical eyes but clear-sighted in his eyes of faith, saw this Nazarene when he blessed Joseph, who was a prefiguring of Christ: 'May they be upon the head of Joseph,' he said, 'and on the crown of the head of the Nazarene among his brothers' [Gen 49:26]. For everything that the law of Moses prescribed according to the flesh about consecrating Nazarenes was fulfilled in Christ in the spiritual sense.[82]

Furthermore, God speaks to David in Psalms thus: 'From the fruit of your belly will I set one upon your throne' [132:11]. And again before this one, Isaiah: 'A rod shall go forth from the root of Jesse and a blossom shall grow out of his root, and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him' [11:1–2]. Now it is agreed that Mary was of the tribe of Judah and the lineage of David, and this did not escape the notice of the Pharisees; when Jesus, before he suffered, asked them whose son the Messiah was to be they promptly answered, 'David's.'[83] The prophet foretold that he would

* * * * *

78 Mic 5:2. The passage is approximately quoted in Matt 2:4–6, where the scribes answer Herod's question. For Erasmus' view of the contradiction between Micah's 'you are least' and Matthew's 'you are not least,' cf the annotation *et tu Bethlehem* (on Matt 2:6).

79 Cf 2:1–7, Matt 2:16–18.

80 Cf Matt 2:19–23, John 19:19.

81 Cf 2:22–4.

82 Cf Numbers 6.

83 Matt 22:41–2. There is an early tradition, not found in the New Testament, that Mary herself was a direct descendant of David, with the consequence that Jesus' lineage is physically from David, not just legally through Mary's husband Joseph. It is accepted by Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.17.4 and 20.1–10, discussed at length in Eusebius *Demonstratio evangelica* 1 PG 22 879–

be born of a virgin. For so Isaiah prophesied: 'For this reason the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel' [7:14]. Daniel foretold the same thing more covertly, explaining what the meaning was of the stone cut from the mountain without hands that crushed the marvellous statue forged of gold, silver, bronze, iron, and clay and soon grew into a great mountain that took over all the kingdoms of the world in its extent.[84] Indeed, Christ, who was born of a virgin without a man's action, will grind down all the kingdoms of the world and will take over the whole globe with his teaching. The inspired Ezekiel surely foresaw this, when he described the eastern gate of the temple through which the majesty of God entered. He spoke about it thus: 'This gate shall be closed, and it shall not be opened, and no man shall cross through it, since the Lord God of Israel entered through it, and it shall be closed for the prince' [44:2–3]. When you hear of the temple of God you recognize the womb of Mary, consecrated by the Holy Spirit. When you hear of the eastern gate, do you not recognize the gateway of virgin modesty which neither the entry of a man nor the entry and exiting of the Son of God violated? Now this is the eastern gate from which comes forth the light that will enlighten the entire world.[85]

Although this mystery is not yet widely known among the Jews, it is not unknown to those who lived in close association with Mary the mother of Jesus and her husband Joseph. For Joseph was provided as the most reliable witness of this secret, which in due time will be celebrated throughout the whole world, that without precedent and by the inspiration of the Spirit of God a virgin bore a child who partook of both natures, the divine and the human.

* * * * *

92, and explicitly stated by Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1673A–B (on 3:23), Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum* 1 PL 26 24B, and Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 361A–B (on 3:23). Erasmus asserts the same thing in this *Paraphrase*, on 2:4 and 3:23, and cites it, in the annotation *viro cui nomen erat Ioseph, de domo David* (on 1:27), as Chrysostom's interpretation (cf Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum* 2 PG 57 28D).

84 Cf Dan 2:31–45.

85 Erasmus often used this passage from Ezekiel as a prophecy of the perpetual virginity of Mary. See his *Paean in Honour of the Virgin* CWE 69 28, his first choice as the OT reading in the *Liturgy of the Virgin Mother as Venerated at Loreto* CWE 69 87, and the treatment of Mary's virginity in his *Explanation of the Apostles' Creed* CWE 70 291. The Marian interpretation of the Ezekiel passage goes back at least to the time of Jerome *Commentarii in Ezechielem* PL 25 430A, who commends those who take the closed gate as the Virgin Mother (on Ezek 44:1–3).

But if it seems incredible to you that God is born from a human being, consider what the prophet Baruch foretold about the son that God, in his pity for the human race, sent to show the way of salvation to the errant and blind. 'This is our God,' he said, 'and no other shall be compared to him. He discovered the whole way of knowledge and gave it to Jacob his servant and to Israel his beloved. After that he was seen on the earth and dwelt with humankind' [Bar 3:35–7]. Further, Daniel even indicates the time of the nativity, calculated by sevens, if anyone examines it closely.[86] But much before him, the patriarch Jacob, already close to death and inspired by a prophetic spirit, prophesied in this fashion: 'The sceptre shall not be taken away from Judah, nor the leader from his thigh, until he who is to be sent comes; and he himself shall be the expectation of the nations' [Gen 49:10]. Already the whole territory of the Jews was in servitude to the Roman emperors. Judea had Herod, a foreign-born king.[87] That fact was sufficient proof that the Messiah would soon come, if anyone had searched out the prophecies.

But the addition 'And he shall be the expectation of nations,' though it will someday be clearer, was already in evidence at the time of the nativity itself. For soon after the Virgin gave birth three magi, led by a star, hastened up with gifts to worship the new king.[88] Nor had the voice of the prophets been silent about the occurrence of this event, for Isaiah speaks thus: 'Before the child knows how to refuse the evil and choose the good, he will receive the spoils of Samaria and Damascus against the king of the Assyrians.'[89] For while the child was still drawing the three magi to himself by the leading of a star, and making worshippers of the king of kings out of idolaters, did he not receive the spoils of Samaria, which was notorious for its worship of images? For Damascus was once classed as part of Arabia before it was transferred to Syrophoenicia at the division of the Syrias. Further, the east is rich in perfumes, whence the magi brought frankincense and myrrh from their ample store. They also brought gold, another thing about which prophecy was not silent. For so says Isaiah: 'They all shall come from Sheba bringing gold and frankincense, and proclaiming praise to the Lord' [60:6]. A psalm prophecy also mentions it: 'And gold of Arabia shall be given him' [72:15]; again in another place: 'Kings of Arabia and Sheba

* * * * *

86 Cf Dan 9:24–5.

87 In the paraphrase on Matt 2:1 Erasmus had said that Herod was Idumaean by birth, not a Jew. Cf also n90 below.

88 Matt 2:2 and 11

89 A conflation of Isa 7:16 and 8:4. See the next note.

shall bring gifts' [72:10]. For in those regions the highest power generally rests with magi, that is, with wise men. By the term 'king of the Assyrians,' then, the wicked king Herod is meant, who was troubled at the news of the Messiah's arrival and was deceived by the magi.[90]

The slaughter of the infants in the territory of Bethlehem followed, and prophecy had not been silent about this either, for so Jeremiah prophesied: 'In a high place is heard a voice of lamentation, weeping, and mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and refusing to be comforted for them, because they are not' [31:15]. That is how he expressed the laments of the mothers weeping for the butchering of their babies. Then he indicated the place allusively, by the name of Rachel, whose tomb is not far from Bethlehem.[91] At the warning of an angel he was taken down into Egypt, and was brought back from there again by the warning of the same angel; did not a prophecy of Hosea foretell this too? 'From Egypt I have called my son.'[92]

Even before he began the task of preaching assigned him by his Father, did not his forerunner John bear witness that he would soon come, and when he did come, did he not point out Jesus to the people of the Jews? Had not Isaiah clearly foretold that that too would happen? 'The voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert highways for our God.' You certainly saw John preaching in the desert, you heard him acknowledge that this prophecy was made about him. And prophecy was not silent even about his baptism.[93] As for the fact that

* * * * *

90 Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.12–13, a refutation of Marcion's interpretation of Isa 7:14 and 8:4, contains the points made here, that the appearance of the magi and presentation of their gifts fulfil the prophecy about the spoils of Samaria and Damascus, including at 13.8 the note *Damascus Arabiae retro deputabatur, antequam transcripta esset in Syrophoenicen ex distinctione Syriarum,* of which Erasmus' sentence beginning 'For Damascus was once claimed' is almost an exact verbal echo. The division of the Syrias into Coele Syria and Syria Phoenice took place between 193 and 198 under the emperor Septimius Severus; see Cassius Dio 75.6–9 and Fergus Millar *The Roman Near East, 31 BC–AD 337* (Cambridge, MA 1993). Tertullian also quotes and discusses Ps 72:10 and 15 in the same place. He says that the magi were regarded in the east as kings, and that they could be called Samaritans because like the Samaritans they practised idolatry but gave it up in worshipping the infant Jesus. He also asserts that therefore Herod is to be identified with the 'king of the Assyrians.' For the Samaritan idolatries cf 2 Kings 17 and the paraphrase on John 4:4 CWE 46 53.

91 Gen 35:19–20

92 Matt 2:13–15, 19–23; Hos 11:1 (quoted at Matt 2:15).

93 Cf 3:15 and the parallel passages in the other three Gospels, all quoting in

Jesus began his preaching not in Jerusalem but in Galilee, did not Isaiah foretell it clearly enough? 'The land of Zebulun, and the land of Naphtali, along the way of the sea across Jordan, of Galilee of the gentiles – the people who sat in darkness have seen a great light; for those sitting in the region of the shadow of death, light has dawned.'[94] Now it is common knowledge that Capernaum, where Jesus first lived when he was preaching, is a coastal city in the neighbourhood of Zebulun and Naphtali.[95]

And the type of teaching that he often used with the people, cloaking his meaning in the riddles of parables, was not concealed. For so a psalm of Asaph has it: 'I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter propositions from the beginning' [Ps 78:2]. Then Isaiah foretold that there would be those who clamoured against his teaching, decrying everything, both his words and his deeds: 'Hear, you hearers, and do not understand; see a vision, and do not learn. Darken the heart of this people and make their ears heavy and close their eyes, lest they see with their eyes and hear with their ears and understand in their heart, and turn, and I heal them' [6:9–10]. He complains about them in another place too: 'Lord, who has believed in what we have heard?' [53:1].

Why, have not the sayings of the prophets even foretold the miracles that you saw him working? Does not Isaiah speak thus: 'Truly he has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows' [53:4]? For what sort of evil did he not beat back from the wretched? The same prophet speaks again even more directly thus: 'Speak, you faint-hearted, and do not be afraid. Behold, your God will bring the recompense of vengeance: God himself will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap like a deer and the tongue of the dumb be loosed' [35:4–6]. Or did you not see Jesus doing these things with your own eyes, and even greater things than these? You heard him himself acknowledging that this prophecy had been made about him, when the disciples sent by John asked him whether he was the expected Messiah

* * * * *

longer or shorter form Isa 40:3–5, whose first verse is quoted here. John points out Jesus in John 1:29–36. On Jesus' baptism cf Ps 2:7 and Isa 42:1, approximately quoted at 3:22 and the synoptic parallels.

94 Cf Matt 4:15–16, a partial quotation of Isa 9:1–2. But Erasmus says 'along the way of the sea' *iuxta viam maris* instead of the Vulgate's nominative *via maris*. In the annotation *via maris* (on Matt 4:15) he had approved Theophylact's suggestion that the accusative ending on 'way' in the Greek implied a missing preposition, such as 'along' or 'beside'; cf *Enarr in Matt* PG 123 184B. A very similar suggestion appears in the interlinear *Gloss* (on Matt 4:15).

95 Cf Matt 4:13, where in the two following verses the Isaiah passage is quoted.

or whether another was to be looked for. He replied, 'Go and say to John what you have seen and heard: the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, the poor are made joyful by the good news of the gospel.'[96]

And as for the fact that the leaders of the synagogue were going to be further exasperated by these great good deeds, did not Isaiah depict it finely in the form of the parable of the vineyard that though encouraged with every attention did not respond to its keeper? 'I have waited,' he said, 'for it to yield grapes, and it yielded wild grapes.' 'I have waited for it to yield justice, and behold, wickedness; and to yield righteousness, and behold, an outcry' [5:4, 7]. Is not the prophetic saying matched by the parable you heard from Jesus himself about the vineyard defended with a tower and equipped with a winepress and a pit, which because of the fault of the tenants did not make a profit for its owner?[97] The fig tree that did not become fruitful even when it was manured had the same meaning. The meaning of the parable of the seed sown in poor ground was the same.[98] He made the same complaints elsewhere also in the prophets: 'I have spread out my hands the whole day to an unbelieving and contrary people' [Isa 65:2]. The powerful envied his might, slanderously claiming that the miracles were done with the aid of Beelzebub.[99]

Moreover, the weakness of his body, the lowliness of his station in life, and the afflictions he suffered were a stumbling-block to those who were weak though not evil. For when he was arrested by the Jews, even the chosen twelve ran away. See whether the prophet Zechariah kept silence about that: 'I will strike the shepherd,' he said, 'and the sheep of the flock will be scattered' [Matt 26:31; cf Zech 13:7]. In agreement with this is Psalm 87: 'You have put my companions far from me; they have counted me a thing of horror to them' [88:8]. Did not Peter deny his Lord with an oath? The others would have done the same if a like danger had threatened. And Christ had foretold that that would be the case before it happened.[100]

* * * * *

96 Luke 7:19–22 and Matt 11:2–6. In 1534 and thereafter *evangelii laeto nuntio exhilarantur* 'are made joyful by the good news of the gospel' is substituted for the two Gospel texts' *evangelizantur* 'have the gospel preached to them.'

97 Luke 20:9–16, but the tower, press, and pit (and a fence not mentioned here) are from the versions in Matt 21:33 and Mark 12:1. See the paraphrase on this passage above.

98 Cf 13:6–9 and 8:5–15 with its synoptic parallels.

99 Cf 11:15, Matt 9:34 and 12:24, Mark 3:22.

100 Cf 22:54–60 (but the oath is in Matt 26:72), 22:34.

He was betrayed by Judas, who was one of the twelve. Consider whether a prophetic psalm did not foretell that too; it says, 'For if my enemy had taunted me I could have borne it, and if he who hated me had spoken insolently about me, I could perhaps have hidden myself from him. But you are a man after my own heart, my guide and my familiar friend' [55:12–13]. Now if you have learned that Christ addressed Judas, who was approaching him to betray his Lord to the soldiers with a lying kiss, in this way: 'Friend, for what purpose have you come? Do you betray the Son of Man with a kiss?'[101] – did he not plainly reproach him with the saying of the prophet? The prophet called him guide because Judas seemed to be in some degree in charge of the apostles, since the oversight of their business dealings had been entrusted to him. Then again another psalm speaks even more clearly: 'For the man of my peace, in whom I hoped, who ate my bread, has exulted in tripping me up' [41:9]. See how the words of Christ match this prophecy, when he spoke of the betrayer to the disciples at the last supper: 'He who has eaten bread with me will lift up his heel against me' [John 13:18]. And again another psalm says, 'My friends and kinsmen have approached and stand against me' [38:11]. And another again: 'His words were softer than oil, yet were they javelins' [55:21]. Is not that speech, 'Hail, Rabbi' [Matt 26:49], said with a kiss, softer than oil? Was it not a javelin dipped in deadly poison? – 'It is he; hold him' [Matt 26:48]. You could have heard this from his own apostles, and if you have not heard it yet, you will still be able to learn of it. Judas made an agreement with the priests and leaders for thirty pieces of silver, and with this blood money a field was shortly bought for the burial of the poor.[102] A prophet foretold both things. One of the prophets prophesied about the price thus: 'And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him on whom some of the sons of Israel had set a price, and gave them for a potter's field.'[103] When all this had been completed, Judas, repenting too late, hanged himself, diminishing the number of the chosen twelve and making a place for substitution on the roll of the apostles. This too was mentioned by the prophets. For a mystic psalm has it thus: 'Let their habitation

* * * * *

101 A conflation of 22:48 with Matt 26:50

102 Cf Matt 27:3–7.

103 Matt 27:9–10, alluding to Zech 11:12–13, but Erasmus suppresses Matthew's identification of the prophet as Jeremiah. The annotation *ager ille Acheldemach* (on Matt 27:8) discusses at length the discrepancy between the Zechariah passage and this passage in Matthew, and the misidentification of the prophet.

be deserted, and let there be no one to live in it, and let another take his office.'[104]

And that wicked council about killing Jesus, held in the house of Caiaphas the high priest, with the scribes, Pharisees, leaders, and those of the people in league with them: see whether this too was not made known in a psalm prophecy, the one that says, 'Why did the gentiles rage, and the peoples plot in vain? The kings of the earth stood near, and the princes were met together against the Lord and against his anointed one' [2:1–2]. You hear 'gentiles' and you know that he was crucified by a cohort of Pilate's; you hear 'peoples' and you recognize that a mixed crowd of Jews cried out, 'Crucify, crucify!' [Luke 23:21]. You hear 'kings' and you recognize Pilate, governor of Judea in Caesar's name, by whose judgment Jesus was condemned. You hear 'princes' of the earth and you understand the leaders of the Jewish people, who, not understanding the spiritual law, sought earthly ends, and while they were refusing to be torn away from these they killed the king of heaven. Isaiah too warned them: 'Woe to the soul of them, because they have devised an evil device against themselves, saying, "Let us bind the righteous man because he is useless to us."'[105] He was led to judgment like a prisoner. Isaiah said this too: 'The Lord stands to judge, and he stands to judge the peoples. The Lord will come to judgment with the elders of his people and with their princes' [3:13–14]. Jesus was judged in the house of Caiaphas by the chief priests, scribes, Pharisees, and leaders of the people. Again at the headquarters of the governor he was condemned by the people's outcry: 'Take him away, take him away, crucify him!' [John 19:15].

* * * * *

104 Acts 1:20, approximately quoting Ps 69:25 and 109:8

105 A quotation from Isa 3:9b–10 in the Septuagint, fuller than what is in the Vulgate and modern English texts: *οὐαὶ τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτῶν, διότι βεβούλευνται βουλὴν πονηρὰν καθ' ἑαυτῶν εἰπόντες, Δήσομεν τὸν δίκαιον ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστί.* The quotation suggests that Erasmus had in mind, if not the Septuagint itself, Jerome's *Commentarii in Isaiam*, which he would have known well from his work on the 1516 Froben edition of Jerome and from his general high regard for that Father. See CWE 61, specifically his dedicatory letter and his Life of Jerome. In commenting on Isa 3:9–11 Jerome had discussed the Hebrew text and added the LXX version of 9b–10 in a Latin wording very like, but not identical to, Erasmus' Latin here (PL 24 66A–B). Justin Martyr *Dialogus* 133 quotes the same Isaiah passage. Cf the Vulgate Isa 3:9, with Wisd of Sol 2:12, almost identical to the saying of the wicked here, and cited eg by Cyprian *Ad Quirinum testimonia* 2.14.

But while the Lord was judged they themselves were judged, their accursed wickedness laid bare in every way. Pilate pronounced sentence against them: 'I am innocent of the blood of this just man; see to it yourselves.' They pronounced sentence against themselves, crying out, 'Let his blood be on us and on our children!' [Matt 27:24 and 25]. Jeremiah also bewails these wicked schemes against Christ: 'Lord, you have seen their wickedness against me; judge my cause. You have seen all their fury, all their devices against me, you have heard their taunt, Lord, all their devices against me, the lips of those who rise against me and their thoughts against me all the day; I have seen their sitting down and their getting up' [Lam 3:59-63]. Does he not here plainly depict the priests and leaders consulting how they might kill Jesus with a lie, hunting up false evidence to crush an innocent man, taunting him with the charge of blasphemy, finding him guilty as a foregone conclusion, sitting down like judges, getting up again to accuse him before the governor? A crime-ridden sitting down, a worse getting up!

Now Jeremiah, in the person of Christ, testifies that not just any death satisfied their hatred but the one most shameful and harshest of all was chosen: 'But you, Lord, have made known to me and I have learned; you showed me their desires, and I was like a meek lamb who is led to the slaughter, and I did not know that they were devising schemes against me, saying, "Let us throw wood against his bread and cut him off from the land of the living, and let his name be mentioned no more."'[106] The Pharisees' scheme was surely this, that once Jesus had been accused, condemned, hanged between notorious criminals, his name would be either entirely obliterated or counted among the damned and cursed. Now recall that Christ before his death foretold to you that he would be given into the hands of gentiles, that he would be reproached, mocked, flogged, crucified; you recognize that none of this was done at random or by chance. Before Annas and Caiaphas the Jews charged him with blasphemy, their harshest

* * * * *

106 Jer 11:18–19. 'Throw wood against his bread' is *mittamus lignum in panem eius* in the Vulgate, ἐμβάλωμεν ξύλον εἰς τὸν ἄρτον αὐτοῦ in LXX. Justin Martyr *Dialogus* 72 and Cyprian *Ad Quirinum testimonia* 2.15 cite the passage as a prophecy of the crucifixion. It is explained by Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.19.3 as prophesying the Jews' plot to have Jesus (the 'bread,' ie his body) executed on the cross (the 'wood'). Jerome *Commentarii in Jeremiam* PL 23 756C (on Jer 11:18–19) likewise says that the meaning is 'let us throw a cross against the body' of the Saviour.

charge, by means of false witnesses. This was prefigured in Joseph, whose brothers, conspiring against him out of jealousy, made an accusation of the worst kind of wrongdoing against him.[107] Before the judges Jesus answered little or nothing, though there was no fault in him, because he had determined to die for the salvation of the world. Suppose that this happened by chance – except that Isaiah foretold it. 'He was offered in sacrifice because he willed it himself, and he opened not his mouth. He will be led like a sheep to the slaughter and like a lamb before its shearer will he be dumb, and will open not his mouth' [53:7]. What a match the psalm prophecy is for this! 'But I did not hear, like one deaf, and like one dumb, who does not open his mouth. And I have become like a man who does not hear and in whose mouth are no rebukes, for in you, Lord, have I hoped' [38:13–15].

For now the time had come for him to expose himself to every shame, to give to his own the perfect example of forbearance: he was bound, beaten with slaps and blows, flogged, spat upon. To mock him he was dressed in a purple cloak, crowned with a crown of thorns. Spurned by Herod, for the shame of it he was sent back in a white garment; pitiable to look upon he was brought before the people; Barabbas was preferred to him. Since he endured this willingly for the salvation of the world in accordance with the predictions of the prophets, he ought not to have engendered despair in you but to have given you hope. Does not Jeremiah bewail this, saying, 'The breath of our mouth, the anointed Lord, is taken in our sins, the one to whom we said, "We will live among the gentiles in your shadow"' [Lam 4:20]? Listen to him again lamenting: 'He will give his cheek to the one who strikes him, he will be filled with insults' [Lam 3:30]. He was slapped by a slave of the high priest in the council of the Jews. He was struck by Pilate's cohort with slaps and blows and a reed, and he did not fight back. Now listen to the psalm prophecy: 'Sinners have worked upon my back, they have drawn out the length of their iniquity' [129:3]. Holy Isaiah agrees with this: 'The Lord God opened [my ear] for me, and I do not refuse, I have not gone backwards. I gave my body to the smiters and my cheeks to

* * * * *

107 For the false witnesses see Matt 26:60–1, Mark 14:57–8; for Joseph and his brothers, Genesis 37. The charge against Joseph invokes a LXX reading. Gen 37:2 Vulg says rather that he charged them with a *crimen pessimum* 'the worst kind of wrongdoing.' Cf Allen Ep 2465:421–34. In Gen 37:18 they conspire against him because of the jealousy and hatred described up to that point. Their complaints against their brother are one of the ways in which Joseph prefigured Christ, according to Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.18.3.

the beard-pullers; I did not turn my face from those insulting and spitting at me.'[108]

Now when you read a prediction of the same prophet in another place, do you not seem to see Christ himself, scourged, spat upon, crowned with thorns, dressed in a cloak, displayed to the people of the Jews as an object of mockery? For so Isaiah writes: 'He has no form or comeliness. And we saw him and he had no beauty, and we desired him but he was despised and least of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with weakness.[109] And his face was as one hidden and despised, whence we had no regard for him. Truly he has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, and we counted him as a leper and as one smitten by God and afflicted. But he was wounded for our iniquities, he was downtrodden for our crimes. The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his bruising have we been healed' [53:2–5]. Then he speaks of himself in a mystic psalm: 'But I am a worm and no man, scorned by men and despised by the people' [22:6]. Nor have the mystic Scriptures been silent about the crown of thorns. Indeed it was first mentioned to Adam: 'Cursed is the ground by your doing.' When you work it 'it will bear thorns and thistles for you' [Gen 3:17, 18]. What the ground was for the first Adam, the Jewish people was for the second Adam – cultivated in so many ways, provoked by so many good deeds to yield good fruit, it yielded its cultivator thorns.[110]

Yet Christ was the bridegroom of the church (as you have heard John giving witness also) but the son of the murdering synagogue.[111] And so in the mystic wedding song the father calls everyone out to this cruel spectacle of the bridegroom crowned with thorns: 'Go out, daughters of Zion, and see king Solomon in the diadem with which his mother crowned him on the day of his betrothal, on the day of his heart's joy' [Song of Sol 3:11]. That bridegroom was certainly a passionate lover, who

* * * * *

108 Isa 50:5–6, omitting *aurem* 'my ear.' Erasmus speaks here of 'Pilate's cohort,' a Roman military unit, but takes a different view of the identity of the soldiers in the paraphrase on John 19:2–3 CWE 46 207.

109 Erasmus' Latin wording of the end of Isa 53:2 and the beginning of 3 is identical to that of the Clementine Vulgate, but it is punctuated differently: *Non est species ei neque decor. Et vidimus eum, et non erat aspectus, et desideravimus eum despectum, et novissimum virorum, virum dolorum et scientem infirmitatem.* The translation here reflects the difference.

110 For the two Adams see 1 Cor 15:45.

111 The Baptist calls Christ a bridegroom at John 3:29. The mother of Christ symbolizes the synagogue in the paraphrase on John 2:1–11 CWE 46 38–41. For the murdering synagogue cf 13:34 and Matt 23:30–7.

washed his bride in his own blood and joined her to him by an indissoluble bond! And this was the day of his betrothal, which he had desired with longing,[112] in the way that every delay would seem long to a lover.[113] Though the governor did everything to release Jesus, the leaders of the Jews, along with the people, cried out in murderous and maddened words, 'Take him away, take him away, crucify him!' [John 19:15]. See[114] how Jeremiah, speaking in the person of Christ, did not keep silent about this: 'I have left my house, I have let my heritage go, I have given my beloved soul into the hands of her enemies. My heritage has become for me like a lion in the forest; she has raised her voice against me' [12:7–8]. But whatever was done to him for shame he will turn to his glory. Herod sent him back to Pilate clothed in a white garment, and one day the people of the gentiles will embrace him as priest. The cohort of soldiers dressed him in a purple cloak and gave him a reed in place of a sceptre. They put on him a crown woven of thorns. The godly will acknowledge and adore their king, conquering and triumphant in just such garb.[115] Herod and Pilate together toyed with him, sending him back and forth like a ball.[116] And in the meantime they became friends, though earlier

* * * * *

112 *quem desiderio desideraverat*, an echo of Jesus' words at 22:15 *desiderio desideravi hoc Pascha manducare vobiscum antequam patiar* 'I have earnestly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer.'

113 'Every delay would seem long to a lover' (*amantis omnis mora longa videretur*) perhaps echoes Ovid *Metamorphoses* 11.450–1: *hoc quoque lenimen, quo solo flexit amantem / 'longa quidem nobis omnis mora'*; on the point of departure for a sea journey Ceyx begins a farewell to his devoted wife Alcyone with 'this comfort, by which alone he swayed his lover, "Long indeed is every delay to us."' Ceyx will drown in a shipwreck, but the husband and wife will be transformed into seabirds and reunited forever. Cf the paraphrase on 12:49 above: 'every delay is already too long for my desire' (*meo desiderio iam omnis mora longa est*).

114 *vide*, in the singular. Erasmus' fictional voice slips for a moment: the voice of Luke the assumed author of the *Paraphrase* has addressed Theophilus, the intended reader, in the singular throughout. But in this declamation the Jesus reported by the Luke-voice has consistently addressed his two companions on the road to Emmaus in the plural.

115 Triumph language, as before in this *Paraphrase*; cf especially the paraphrases on 19:38–40 and 23:31–4, and the index. Roman generals in their triumphal processions wore purple. The theme is renewed below; cf n132.

116 *inter sese veluti sphaeram mittentes*; cf *Adagia* III i 99: *Sphaeram inter sese reddere* 'To throw the ball from one to another' CWE 34 222–3. In the explanatory essay Erasmus says, '[the adage will] suit those who are all mutual admiration, and in disputation play into one another's hands ... in such a way that there is

they had been at odds in mutual hatred, in this way too commending the conciliator and peacemaker of all things in heaven and on earth, of whom Job prophesied: 'The Lord reconciles the hearts of the princes of the earth.'[117]

Now once more recreate with me in your imagination the spectacle you recently saw with your own eyes, Jesus going out to the place of execution and carrying his cross on his shoulders. Had he not often indicated that this would happen, when he spoke to his disciples and to the crowd? 'One who does not take up his cross and follow me is not worthy of me.'[118] This truly was the sceptre of the king of the Jews, that is, of all who confess him,[119] the sceptre that Isaiah saw on his shoulders long ago, when he said, 'And the government will be upon his shoulder' [9:6]. Isaac, ages before, displayed a prefiguring of him, carrying the bundle of wood for his own sacrifice as a burnt offering.[120] Isaac is preserved to us; only a ram has been sacrificed, that is, the body of Jesus, which alone was capable of dying, though soon to live again. Furthermore, he was killed outside the city. Christ himself had indicated that this would happen, in the parable about the tenants who cast the son out of the vineyard and killed him.[121] But Moses indicated it long before, when, as you read in Leviticus, he ordered the calf that was sacrificed for the sins of the people to be carried outside the camp and burned there.[122] And was it not outside Jerusalem that Jesus was allegorically burned, who expended his entire self because he was aflame with an immeasurable fire of love for the human race?

When you saw Jesus hanging high on the tree, did the recollection not come to you of the mystic serpent that Moses once hung on a pole to

* * * * *

no search for truth, but some sort of stage-play seems to be acted in front of you.'

117 For the friendship formed between Herod and Pilate see 23:12. For the prophecy see Job 12:24 in the Vulgate and Septuagint versions, not modern English texts. The Vulgate reads *inmutat corda* 'he changes the hearts.' The Septuagint says διαλλάσσων καρδίας, where the verb διαλλάσσειν 'change' has the connotation of changing from enmity to friendship, reflected in Erasmus' *reconciliat corda* and the thrust of his comment here.

118 Cf Matt 10:38 and the synoptic parallels.

119 For the definition of 'Jew' as 'confessor' cf Jerome *De nominibus Hebraicis* CCL 72 136 and eg the paraphrase on John 19:19 CWE 46 212 with n30.

120 Gen 22:1–14. Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.18.2 cites Isaac and his bundle of wood as a prefiguring of Christ carrying his cross.

121 Cf 20:9–16 and the paraphrase there.

122 Lev 4:1–21

be safety for all who had been bitten by serpents, provided only that they turn their eyes towards it?[123] Faith is the eye of a human being. Whoever turns his eye towards the crucified Jesus will be saved then and there. But Moses had also foretold that when the Jews looked at Jesus hanging on the cross, Jesus who by his death gave life to everyone, they would still not believe in him. So he says in Deuteronomy: 'And your life will be hanging before your eyes. You will be afraid night and day, and you will not have confidence in your life' [28:66]. You saw him hanging between two thieves, and do you not recognize the prophecy that said, 'And he was counted among the transgressors' [Isa 53:12]? You saw night come up suddenly at midday, from the sixth hour until the ninth hour. Christ himself foretold that he was the light of the world, and indicated that the night was at hand when he must be lifted up out of the world.[124] Did not Amos clearly foretell this? 'And on that day, says the Lord, the sun will set at noon, and I shall darken the earth in broad daylight' [8:9]. Nor was Zechariah silent on the subject, when he said, 'And on that day there will be not light but cold and frost, and that will be the one day which is known to the Lord. There will be neither day nor night; there will be light at evening time' [14:6–7]. That was the day known to the Lord, but the Jews did not recognize it. It was not day, because night came at noontime; it was not night, because the light returned from the ninth hour on. But there was cold and frost in the hearts of the fleeing and desperate disciples, among whom was Peter, who even denied his Lord while numbed with cold he warmed himself at the coals of the ungodly.[125]

Now compare what happened while Christ was hanging on the cross. When he thirsted, myrrhed wine and vinegar were offered to him, just as they had offered myrrhed wine while he carried his cross.[126] Did not the psalm prophecy foretell it plainly? 'They gave me gall to be my food, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink' [69:21]. You have heard the Pharisees and leaders exulting like conquerors over him as he hung

* * * * *

123 Num 21:6–9; cf John 3:14 and 12:32. The bronze serpent is regularly cited as a type of Jesus on the cross, at least from Justin Martyr *Dialogus* 94 and 112, *Apologia 1* 60 onwards.

124 See John 8:12, 9:5, 12:34–6.

125 Cf the paraphrases on 22:55 and 62 above.

126 The wine offered to Christ on the cross is identified in the Gospels as *acetum* 'vinegar' but explained in the paraphrase on John 19:29 as a type of wine; see 23:36 and parallels in the other Gospels. For the wine offered to him before the crucifixion see Matt 27:34 (wine mixed with gall) and Mark 15:23 (*myrrhatum vinum* 'myrrhed wine').

there, and among other insults taunting him with this: 'He said he was the Son of God, he trusted in the Lord; let him deliver him now if he wants him.'[127] See how the psalm prophecy not only foretold the actual event but even reported the very words of the ungodly: 'But I am a worm and no man, an object of human reproach and rejected by the people. All who saw me have mocked me, they have spoken with their lips and wagged their heads, saying, "He hoped in the Lord, let him rescue him, let him save him, since he wants him!"' [22:6–8]. You saw the lamb foretold by Isaiah, dumb before all insults and even praying for those responsible for his death: 'Father, pardon them, they do not know what they do.'[128] Now see whether he did not also prophesy this: 'They have spoken against me with a lying tongue, and have surrounded me with words of hatred and have assaulted me without cause. Instead of loving me they disparaged me, but I prayed for them' [Ps 109:2–4]. You saw him fastened to the cross with nails, hanging there naked, his body stretched out. Now hear the plain prophecy: 'They pierced my hands and my feet, they numbered all my bones' [Ps 22:16–17]. You saw the soldiers dividing the garments of the crucified Jesus among themselves. This too follows in the psalm's prophecy: 'They divided my garments among them, and for my raiment they cast lots' [22:18]. They did divide the other garments; for the tunic woven in one piece, since it could not be unstitched, the decision was by lot.[129] You heard that when he was just on the point of breathing his last he said in a loud voice: 'Father, into your hands I commend my spirit' [Luke 23:46], making it clear that the psalm prophecy had spoken about him.[130] You saw the legs of the two thieves broken, but Jesus' legs were not broken, so that by this sign as well he might make it clear that he was the true paschal lamb, whose blood has delivered all who believe from everlasting death; of this lamb it was directed in Exodus: 'You shall not break a bone of it' [12:46].

* * * * *

127 Matt 27:43. Erasmus' quotation, however, moves the report of Jesus' claim to be the Son of God to begin the verse, instead of putting it at the end. He makes the same rearrangement in the paraphrase on this verse (LB VII 142A).

128 Cf Isa 53:7 and Luke 23:34, but Erasmus changes the *dimitte* 'forgive' in the Latin text of the Gospel to *ignosce* 'pardon,' as he had also in the paraphrase on the verse.

129 Cf 23:34 and synoptic parallels, John 19:23–4.

130 Cf Ps 31:5. While the preceding narrative had described what the two disciples saw of the trial and crucifixion, down to their seeing the soldiers divide Jesus' garments, this sentence reports what they heard that Jesus had said. The implication is that they were not within earshot; cf 23:49 and the paraphrase on it.

You could also have noticed that he overcame the resources of the world and Satan by a variety of means. By simplicity he overcame cunning, by gentleness he overcame savagery, by lowliness he overcame glory, by friendliness he overcame arrogance – thus by weakness he overcame the might of Satan. For what is weaker than a dying man? Yet you saw how much strength this weakness had. You observed the sun grow dark, the earth shake, the rocks explode, the tombs gape open, the veil of the temple tear. These things merely made clear that his eminent strength, whereby he defeated the world and the devil, had been unshackled in his dying. The mystic psalm had foretold this too, saying, 'Tell it among the nations, God has reigned from the tree.'[131] Nor was the prophet Habakkuk silent about it: 'His brightness will be like the light. Horns are in his hand; there is his power hidden. Death will go before his face. The devil will go out before his feet' [3:4–5]. You are hearing of the horns of the cross, whose weakness deceived the prince of this world; for that is where the Lord Jesus had hidden heavenly might, in order to crush the devil. He triumphed over death, and led Satan in his victory procession, and made a spectacle of him.[132] He himself before he died had foretold that this would happen: 'When I am raised from the earth, I shall draw all things to me' [John 12:32]. Moses had indicated the same thing when he was close to death, though assuredly in a more enigmatic riddle. For when he was blessing the tribes one by one and had gotten to Joseph, who was a type of Christ, he said, 'His beauty is as of a firstborn bull, and his horns are the horns of the rhinoceros; with them he will winnow the peoples to the ends of the earth' [Deut 33:17]. So it seemed best to the divine wisdom that Christ subdue the whole world by the horns of the cross.[133]

* * * * *

131 Ps 96:10, but the phrase *a ligno* 'from the tree' does not appear in the received Greek or Latin texts of Scripture. It was known to the early apologists and is found in Justin Martyr *Apologia* 1 41 and *Dialogus* 73, Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.19.1 and *Adversus Iudaeos* 10.11, and in the hymn *Vexilla regis* of Venantius Fortunatus.

132 Triumph imagery and language again; see n115 above and cf 2 Cor 2:14, Col 2:15. For *traducere* 'leading in procession' one of only a few *trans-* compounds that appear in formal descriptions of triumphs, see Jane E. Phillips 'Form and Language in Livy's Triumph Notices' *Classical Philology* 69 (1974) 271–2.

133 For the blessing of Joseph as a type of Christ cf Justin Martyr *Dialogus* 91, Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.18.3. Tertullian continues immediately with an explanation of the term 'horns' as applied to the ends of the upright and the crossbar of a cross, saying that it is a borrowing from nautical terminology for the analogous parts of a mast and yardarm. Erasmus had used the same figure at the end of the apostrophe to Theophilus in the paraphrase on 23:34.

Nor were the prophets silent about his burial. For so Jeremiah writes, in the person of Christ: 'My life slid into the pit, and they have placed a stone over me' [Lam 3:53]. For you know that he was buried in a rock-cut tomb, and that the mouth of the tomb was closed with a huge stone so that no one could remove the dead man's body. Near nightfall on the day of Preparation he was buried in the tomb; there he rested on the sabbath, since now, of course, the work of human salvation was complete. Consider whether or not prophecy had foretold this too: 'The righteous man,' it says, 'has been taken from the sight of wickedness, and his place will be at peace.'[134] Up until his death he allowed himself to be handled by sinful people. After his death he did not want to be touched by anyone except by his friends, and thereafter he made himself visible to none but his friends. The hidden meaning of this fact had been given by an old prophecy of Jacob the patriarch, who when he was dying prophesied about Judah, or rather about Christ, as follows: 'You have lain down like a lion; who will rouse him?'[135]

Then was it not foretold plainly by the prophets that just as he was willing to die and be buried, even so he would not decay in the tomb but, remaining there for the merest interval, would come back to life? Does not the Holy Spirit in the fifteenth psalm say as much? 'You will not abandon my soul in the underworld, nor let your holy one see decay' [16:10]. No aromatics, no ointments, make it possible for a lifeless body never to decay, since time itself takes away even aromatics, and destroys tombs also, marble though they be. Resurrection does make this possible, since it bestows immortality. Did not the prophet Jonah long ago completely prefigure this event? The storm was blamed on him, and to prevent everyone's being lost, he was thrown headlong into the sea; thus the storm that threatened destruction for all would be calmed by the loss of one. Christ died for the salvation of all, to expiate the sins of all. Jonah was swallowed by a whale, and on the third day, contrary to all expectation, he was released

* * * * *

134 *a conspectu iniquitatis ablatus est iustus, et erit in pace locus eius.* Erasmus' Latin here approximates the meaning of, but is not identical to, the wording of Isa 57:1b–2a in the Vulgate: *a facie enim malitiae collectus est iustus; veniat pax; requiescat in cubili suo* 'for the just man is taken away from before the face of evil. Let peace come; let him rest in his bed' (DV). It is closer to the Septuagint text: ἀπὸ γὰρ προσώπου ἀδικίας ἦρται ὁ δίκαιος· ἔσται ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἡ ταφὴ αὐτοῦ. Parts of Isa 57:1–2 are quoted or adapted by Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem* 3.19.8 and 22.5, 4.28.3 and 43.2, but closer parallels are in Justin Martyr *Apologia* 1 48 and Cyprian *Ad Quirinum testimonia* 2.14.

135 Gen 49:9, with the omission of 'and like a lioness' after 'lion'

from its belly. Christ was buried in the tomb, from which he promised that he would come forth on the third day. For when the Jews were asking for a sign from heaven he promised them the sign of the prophet Jonah, and that like Jonah he would flash forth from the secret places of the earth on the third day.[136] How many times did he impress upon his disciples that he would die and return to life on the third day! The prophet Hosea had foretold it: 'After two days he will revive us, on the third day he will raise us up' [6:2].

So when you see that so far everything is completely consistent, the prefigurings of the Law, the predictions of the prophets, the prophecies of Christ himself, and finally the actual course of events, how is it that now, as if you were drowsing and dreaming, you are distrustful? How is it that you are not rather drawing conclusions about the future from the past? He foretold that he would be handed over to the gentiles, bound, flogged, mocked, crucified. Every one of these happened. You saw, and you believe; but he also foretold that on the third day he would live again, and for some days show himself – not to the world, but to his disciples.[137] Why then do you not trust the women, who say that they learned from angels that he had risen? Is the weakness of a dead body such a stumbling block to you that you now despair, as if all his grand promises had come to naught – the kingdom, the handing over of the power of heaven and earth to the Son, the ascent into heaven and the return to the Father, the sitting at the right hand of the Father, the spread of the gospel through all the nations of the world, the glorious coming at the end of the world, the immortality of the saints, the punishment of the sinful? No indeed: his death has opened the way to these majestic things. Just as you saw him dead and buried, so you will see him alive again, you will see him ascending into heaven. You will receive the heavenly Spirit, you will see heavenly power extend itself in lowly and uneducated persons; through the same persons in a short time you will see the light of the gospel hold the whole earth in its rays. And the Jesus who was here scorned, spat upon, and mocked the whole world will adore as equal to God the Father and consort of his kingdom. Ultimately the whole human race will see him in his Father's majesty, encompassed by ranks of angels, judging the living and the dead. He has wished that day to be known definitely to no one. In the meantime he has wished his own to care for nothing but the gospel kingdom. All these things have been

* * * * *

136 Cf 11:29–32, Matt 12:38–40.

137 For Christ's predictions of his resurrection and return, cf Matt 12:38 and John 2:21–2, 14:18–21, and 16:16–23.

foretold by the prophets, signified by the figures of the law of Moses, and in large part fulfilled. There should be no doubt that all of them are to be accomplished in due time.

This discourse from the Lord Jesus, not only striking the disciples' ears but also penetrating their hearts, so occupied them that they neither took notice of the difficulty of the road nor recognized the face of the speaker. Nor did it occur to them to think to themselves, 'Who is this who has Holy Scripture at his beck and call, the whole teaching and life of Jesus, and who keeps us intent and deeply moved with such powerful words? We never saw him among the disciples, and yet nothing has escaped him.' They loved him only as if in a dream, and rejoiced to learn Jesus from Jesus himself. For learning is never more fruitful than when he deigns to teach us about himself.

The journey being whiled away in these and other tales, they were now approaching the little town called Emmaus. And in order to fire their longing more, Jesus made as if he did not care to stay in Emmaus but wanted to travel further on. For the two disciples had left Jerusalem virtually without hope, and were making their way back to their birthplace – though those who have once truly believed in Christ have no permanent city here but are continually journeying towards the heavenly city.[138] But since the disciples could not be torn away from so eloquent a companion, they asked, begged, pleaded, and finally, with unrelenting prayers and hands tugging at his cloak, insisted, though he tried to refuse, that he stay the night with them. By now they were calling him Lord, not because they realized he was Jesus but because they had fairly well concluded from the wonderful conversation that he was no common traveler.[139]

* * * * *

138 Cf Heb 13:14.

139 For the elaborate amplification of *coegerunt* 'they constrained him,' cf the remark of Gregory the Great *Hom in evang* 23 PL 76 1182D: 'The point is that strangers are to be not only invited but dragged to hospitality.' It is quoted by Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 627B and Hugh of St Cher (on 24:29) 275r.
Here and in the next sentence 'Lord' is *Domine*, both a Latin title of respect for superiors equivalent to 'Sir' and a specific appellation of divine persons. Cf John 4:11 and its paraphrase CWE 46 55 and n21. In verse 29 *Domine* is found in Vulgates contemporary with Erasmus (for instance, the 1498 Froben-Petri edition with the *Gloss* and Nicholas of Lyra), though it is not in the Clementine or Weber Vulgates or modern translations.
'Conversation' is *confabulatio*, and 'tales' at the beginning of the paragraph is *fabulae*; cf n16 above.

They said, 'Lord, you have shown yourself thus far a pleasant and amiable companion to us on the road; now be our guest. Why commit yourself to a longer journey? Evening is already coming on and the sun is close to setting.' Those who love Jesus are right to hate the night; and yet they who have Jesus as their companion ought not fear this world's night. And he loves to be asked to do what he does gladly, partly so that he may give to the well-deserving and worthy, and partly to teach us that an act of kindness must even be urged and pressed upon a needy neighbour.[140] For some people offer a kindness as if they are afraid that the one to whom it is offered will not refuse it, and they give it with an expression that makes them appear to be giving it unwillingly. So he came into the town and showed no reluctance to enjoy their hospitality.

Overjoyed at so great a guest, when they had provided him what is usually provided to welcome guests, they also set a table and served what they had, given their slender means. The arrangements were sparse, but above all there were their cheerful faces,[141] matching their honest heart. But after Jesus was at table with them, he took bread, blessed and broke it, and then offered it to them. Since they knew that it was a practice peculiar to Christ to give thanks to the Father before eating and then to distribute among his disciples bread broken with his own hands, the two disciples, as if awakened from sleep, began to think of Jesus. Soon, with the removal of the impediment that had so far prevented them from recognizing him, they suddenly realized that this man was Jesus. And while sudden amazement gripped their hearts, Jesus vanished from their sight. For after his death he made his body available gradually and sparingly, either because human weakness would not bear the majesty of the resurrected body or to accustom them slowly to being without the sight of his body; it was going to be taken away soon so that they would then love him in spirit. Also, they did not recognize Jesus except in the house, that is, the church; they did not recognize him except when he himself offered them the bread of the gospel

* * * * *

140 For the image of the dangers of darkness, cf the paraphrases on John 6:16–17 and 11:10 CWE 46 78–9 and 140–1. For Jesus' love of being asked to do what he does, cf the paraphrase on 19:5 above. For pressing kindness upon a needy neighbour, cf the paraphrase on 16:1–7 above.

141 'Above all there were their cheerful faces' is *sed ante omnia vultus accessere boni*, a near-quotation from Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.677–8, where the elderly couple Baucis and Philemon are serving the best dinner their humble cottage can offer to two travellers who they do not realize are the gods Jupiter and Mercury in disguise: *super omnia vultus accessere boni*.

word.[142] For that is what opens the eyes by which Jesus is recognized. He had broken and offered that bread mystically during the journey, when he unveiled the Scriptures to them. And what he had done there in spirit he afterward renewed in the bodily sign.

When Jesus was taken away in body they now saw him better than when he was with them in body. Their eyes had been held fast because they did not believe. Now, though he was not there, they saw him with the eyes of faith. After Jesus' departure they did not cease talking together[143] about Jesus, saying, 'How was it that we recognized the Lord so belatedly? A drowsiness had hold of our minds: the blessing, the bread broken and offered first shook the drowsiness out of us. But if we had not been so sleepy, we could just as well have guessed that he was Jesus from his conversation, since he told us so many things about Jesus in such an amazing way. When he was explaining to us the puzzles of figures and prophecies from Scripture in personal conversation as we travelled, didn't we feel a kind of marvellous glowing in our heart, nothing like the feeling that the speeches of the scribes and Pharisees regularly produce in the hearts of the hearers? But the speech of the Lord Jesus used to be just like that to those who listened to him with open minds. He pricked his hearers, moved them, carried them out of themselves, seared them, set them afire, left sparks and darts in their hearts.'[144]

When each had admitted to the other that he had been equally affected and they no longer doubted that the man was Jesus returned from the dead, they immediately left Emmaus, though day was by now drawing to its close, and returned to Jerusalem in great haste so that they could make the other disciples also partakers in such great joy and so that the faith of all might be strengthened by shared comparison of their experiences.[145] For the Lord

* * * * *

142 The house symbolizes the church; cf the paraphrases on 19:6 and 22:10–13 above. The bread is the gospel word (*sermo evangelicus*); cf the paraphrases on 9:10–17 and on John 6, with the notes on Erasmus' eucharistic theology in that chapter in CWE 46. Hugh of St Cher (on 24:30) 275r notes here that the bread is the word of God, citing Ps 104:15.

143 *confabulari*; cf nn16 and 139 above. But in the disciples' words that follow, 'conversation' translates *colloquium* and 'speech(es)' *oratio*.

144 The disciples' burning hearts of verse 32 invite amplification in the exegetical tradition. Cf Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 627C, who is followed by the *Gloss* (on 24:32), and Hugh of St Cher (on 24:32) 275r; Hugh draws specifically on biblical metaphors.

145 Cf Rom 1:12 and the paraphrase and annotation on it CWE 42 16 and CWE 56 36–8 respectively.

desires his gifts to be spread among humankind in this fashion, so that in the exchange of services to each other love will increase among them and merits will grow in number for God to reward. They were slow when they were going away from Jerusalem, because Jesus their fellow in conversation both distracted them from the weariness of the journey and took away their desire to reach their stopping place. But eagerness to report what had taken place and to find out in their turn what had happened to the others put wings on their feet[146] as they went back. When they got there they found the eleven apostles (by now Judas had left the number of the twelve), and with them were also many other disciples.

Without waiting to hear what the two had to say, the others joyfully told them that after the tentative hope of the Lord's resurrection held out by the women first of all, it had been ascertained that he had truly risen. For he had also appeared to Simon Peter. This man's report, since he held first place among the disciples, got more credence from the disciples than the women's words. The Lord Jesus wanted him to be comforted first, and wanted to give strength by his presence to one whom he knew to be labouring, even beyond the general failing of insufficient faith, under the guilt of having denied his Lord.[147] Happy at this news, the two disciples in turn told how on their journey to Emmaus someone they did not know joined them in the guise of a traveller; he had taken the opportunity to relate many things about Jesus, repeating from the writings of Moses and the prophets whatever had been foretold about Jesus and also relating what had taken place and would take place in the future; and they had not recognized him until they finally did so from his own particular way of blessing, breaking, and offering bread.

* * * * *

146 'Put wings on their feet' (*pedibus addidit alas*) is quite like the thought of *Adagia* I ii 42: *Talaria induere* 'To put wings on one's feet,' explained as getting ready to flee and take flight, from Homer *Iliad* 24.340–2, *Odyssey* 1.96–8, and Virgil *Aeneid* 4.239–41. In the passages cited by Erasmus, however, Mercury is described not as fleeing but as swiftly carrying a message, as also here. Erasmus' wording in the paraphrase echoes Virgil *Aeneid* 8.224, the description of the monster Cacus fleeing an attack by Hercules: *pedibus timor addidit alas* 'fear put wings on his feet.'

147 Erasmus' treatment of Peter here has some thematic relation to Chrysostom *Homiliae in Ioannem* 88 PG 59 478–81 (on John 21:15–25) and also perhaps to the extensive treatment of Peter and his relation to Jesus that Ambrose includes in his exposition of Luke 24, which is really a harmonization of all the post-resurrection appearances, especially those reported in John and Luke (*Expos in Lucam* PL 15 1941C–1943B).

While they were comforting and cheering each other with holy conversations of this kind, some of them believing and some still uncertain,[148] without warning the Lord Jesus entered, though the doors were shut – and no one saw him approach, but suddenly he stood in their midst. Indeed, angels appear suddenly like this, visible when they choose to be, and disappearing just as suddenly when it suits them. Now good spirits, when they appear, customarily remove fear by a gentle mode of address, so that weak human nature is not thrown into a panic. Just so the Lord, since he was unexpected and since it was late in the evening when he made himself visible, addressed them in gentle words, saying, 'Peace to you; it is I. Don't be afraid.'[149]

Though this statement ought properly to have driven out all alarm, the weakness of some of the disciples was still so great that panic-stricken and half-dead with fear they did not believe it was Jesus but thought they were seeing a spirit. A short time earlier they had seen him dead and buried; they now saw that he had not come in by the door but had appeared without warning. So they were not able to persuade themselves that it was Jesus' body that they were seeing; they thought it was a spirit. (For common folk tell stories of this kind, that the spirits of the dead sometimes appear to whomever they choose, and do indeed present a bodily appearance to mortal eyes, but they do not have a real, tangible body.)[150] Thomas was of this opinion,[151] who had said that he would not put any confidence in the

* * * * *

148 Augustine *De consensu evangelistarum* 3.25 says, comparing this part of Luke with Mark 16:13, that some of those present must have been unwilling to believe. Hugh of St Cher (on 24:36) 275v has a similar comment.

149 Not all of the saying is in modern texts of Luke, though it is part at least of the Latin tradition; see Nestle-Aland and Fitzmyer AB Luke on the verse. In the annotation *ego sum, nolite timere* (on 24:36) Erasmus had noted that in his Greek texts he found only 'Peace to you' and suggested that the rest was added from another evangelist. Cf Matt 14:27. However, he makes no change here.

The gentleness of angels as well as the unexpectedness of their appearance is also a feature of the paraphrases on 1:11–13, 1:28–30, and John 20:12–15 CWE 46 217–18; cf the paraphrase on John 6:19–20 CWE 46 79.

150 Cf Augustine *Sermones de scripturis* 116 PL 38 659, Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 628D–629A, Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1121A.

151 *in hac sententia erat Thomas*, the reading of *1534* and *1535*. In the first two editions the sentence read 'Thomas was among them' *in hos*. Béda and the Paris faculty of theology criticized this sentence plus the paraphrase on verse 33 above, where the eleven disciples mentioned by the Gospel text are explained by the previous departure of Judas; the criticism was of Erasmus' apparent

disciples who told him they had seen the Lord unless he were to put his fingers in Jesus' side and explore all the traces of the nails and the lance. And other disciples appear to have felt no differently.[152]

In order to make everyone's faith quite sure that he was alive and was in possession of a real body, and no other body than the one he had had before, Jesus said to them, 'Why are you still panicked as if at a ghost, when you see me with your eyes and recognize my form, when you hear a voice that is familiar and well known to you? And yet distrustful thoughts, such as occur to common folk, are still welling up in your hearts. Satisfy all your senses; observe my hands and feet – they have the unmistakable marks of the nails; touch my side – it has the wound from the lance. Handle my body, bring your eyes close, and stop imagining that I am a spirit. For a spirit has neither flesh nor bones, as you see I do have. The fact that I came in though the doors were closed, the fact that I am visible when I want to be and invisible when I want is not a piece of trickery but the endowment of a body now become immortal. Such will your bodies be too, after the resurrection.'

When Jesus had taken away their fear and given them courage with these words, he presented his hands and feet to be looked at; he bared his side so they could touch the unmistakable traces of his wounds. For the Lord wanted to keep these marks so that by such proofs he could attest the reality of his human body to his followers, and likewise in time to come prove their unbelief against the Jews on the last day, according to the

* * * * *

statement that Thomas was present for the appearance of Jesus reported in verses 36–51, though if this is the same appearance reported in John 20:19–24, Thomas was definitely not there. Erasmus replied in the *Divinationes* LB IX 494C–496C, the *Elenchus* LB IX 494E–F, and the *Supputatio* LB IX 621F–622A, all published between the second and third editions of the *Paraphrase*. The first of these is the most detailed. Having reviewed the inconclusive history of opinion on, and proposed solutions of, the contradiction between Luke's 'eleven' and John's report of Thomas' absence, he says he follows what seems likeliest, that Thomas was there but unconvinced by what he saw, and was only satisfied by touching Jesus' wounds on a later occasion, the one reported by John. At the end, however, he notes that on rereading what he had written he sees that *in hos* refers not to the eleven but to those who believe in apparitions of the dead; so Béda is misreading the *Paraphrase*, for Erasmus neither affirmed nor denied Thomas' presence. In the *Elenchus* he says that he has removed the troublesome expression in the next edition. So in *1534* the replacement *in hac sententia* appears.

152 This sentence does not appear until *1535*. It is probably connected to the dispute described in the previous note.

prophecy that says, 'They shall look upon him whom they have pierced.'[153] Indeed, even then there were those who did not yet openly believe that it was the same body they had seen dead, but a kind of drunkenness of joy had hold of their hearts, so that they did not have complete confidence in either their eyes or their ears or their hands (for sometimes we are afraid to believe what we desperately want to be true, fearing that we may be hurling ourselves into a false joy of which we must shortly be stripped). But Jesus did not disdain to heal their unbelief by all kinds of proofs so that no distrust would remain in us, and said, 'Do you have anything to eat here?' For there is no surer proof that a person is alive than taking food. That is why our Lord Jesus ordered the girl he had brought back to life to be given food, and similarly with Lazarus.[154] Not that we are going to be hungry when we are resurrected to immortality, but he wanted to prove to his disciples on that occasion the reality of his human body. There were quite a few disciples there, and yet their provisions were quite scanty. So they brought him what they had, part of a grilled fish and a honeycomb.[155] And Jesus, in the sight of everyone, ate of the things that were put before him.[156]

Once he had used all their senses to establish confidence that he was not a ghost but a real, living person, the same one they had earlier seen both living and dying, he came back to Holy Scripture, in which they were to have confidence even if human perceptions cried out in protest. 'You need not be surprised,' he said, 'that the things you are seeing have taken place. Scripture cannot lie,[157] since it has been produced by inspiration of the heavenly Spirit. Whatever has taken place till now was foretold and prefigured in the books of Moses, in the prophets, in the psalms. For I am the one to whom the figures of the Mosaic law pointed. I am the one about whom the holy prophets made so many promises. I am the one whose coming, career, and consummation the mystic psalms describe. And with

* * * * *

153 Zech 12:10, quoted at John 19:37 and by Hugh of St Cher (on 24:40) 276r

154 Cf 8:55 and John 12:1–2 with the paraphrase on that passage in CWE 46 149.

155 The honeycomb does not appear in modern editions; cf Nestle-Aland and Fitzmyer AB Luke on 24:42.

156 Erasmus does not paraphrase the version of verse 43 found in the Vulgate of his day, which reads 'and when he had eaten in their sight, taking the remains he gave them to them.' In the annotation *et cum manducasset coram eis* (on 24:43) he had said that his Greek texts did not agree with the Vulgate but read instead, 'Taking [the food] he ate in their sight,' and continued with the opening words of verse 44.

157 *nescit mentiri Scriptura.* Cf the paraphrase on 21:22, and again on verse 46 below.

equal reliability all the remaining prophecies in these same Scriptures will be made good too, about my return to heaven, about the sending of the heavenly Spirit, who will, when this poor body has been taken away, make you firmer in spreading the gospel throughout the whole world, and about the ultimate end of this world. These are the things I impressed upon you so many times, while I still dwelt as a mortal among mortals. They did not take root in your hearts at that time; but now you cannot have any doubt, since you see that my words are in accord with the mysteries of Scripture and that the outcome of events is in accord with both. Till now I have indulged the weakness of your flesh as the situation required, and I have borne the truth of the matter in upon you by means of fairly obvious proofs. From now on, you are to advance to a spiritual understanding of Scripture. From now on that is where you will see me, that is where you will hear me.'[158]

But since the mystic writings are not understood unless God opens our mind, Jesus opened the eyes of their heart, so that they might read, believe, and understand what was written. For only the believer understands. 'It seemed good to my Father,' he said, 'to restore the human race by means of this course of events, and what he had decided upon was by his inspiration made known in the divine text. I foretold the same thing before it came to pass, and it could not have happened otherwise, because the decrees of God cannot be changed, and Holy Scripture can no more lie than can the Spirit himself by whose inspiration it is made known. The road to glory was through death and the shame of the cross; resurrection on the third day was necessary so that you would know that you have a living Lord and advocate who hereafter will not die. When he returns to heaven he will send you thence the heavenly Spirit.

'Then in the name of Jesus Christ you must preach repentance of former life and remission of all sins without keeping the law of Moses. Remission will be granted to all through the gospel faith alone. I have paid the penalty in the name of all; they need only believe and they will attain to innocence without cost. And you must preach not only to the Jews but to all the nations of the world, though you will take your start from Jerusalem.[159]

* * * * *

158 That Jesus is most accessible in Scripture is a familiar Erasmian theme, notably at the end of the *Paraclesis* LB V 144C–D and VI *4V. It is also a subtext of Erasmus' guidance on the way to read Scripture in the *Ratio verae theologiae*. See also chapter 19 n13 and the paraphrase there.

159 'Though you will take your start from Jerusalem.' The clause in Erasmus' Latin of which this is a translation paraphrases *incipientibus ab Ierusalem* '[by

I was born in Judea, there I performed miracles; I taught in Jerusalem and there I met my death. Among these people you will find hearts in many ways already prepared for faith. For them you will recall what you have seen and heard. You will transmit to them my teaching, which I handed on to you as I received it from my Father. The world will rail against your testimony, as it has always railed against me.

'But I shall send you, as I said, a Spirit from the Father, the one that he once promised through the prophets he would send, saying through the mouth of Joel, "And hereafter I shall pour out my Spirit on all flesh, and your sons and your daughters will prophesy" [2:28].[160] Holy David too prayed for that Spirit, saying, "Send out your Spirit and they shall be created, and you shall renew the face of the earth" [Ps 104:30]. That Spirit will make you strong and invincible against all the terrors of the world. And he will give you an eloquence that none can contradict. He will give you power to work miracles, so that your testimony about me will be persuasive.[161] In the meantime, stay quiet; gather together and wait here in Jerusalem, and begin on the harmony of the church that is soon to be born. Encourage one another in holy conversations, praying and giving thanks to God until that Spirit comes from on high who will equip you with power and heavenly strength.'[162]

And so after Jesus had affirmed the reality of his resurrection by various proofs, he led his disciples to Bethany. And now on the point of going away to heaven, he lifted up his hands and blessed them, in this too reflecting the example of the patriarchs and of Moses.[163] And while he prayed for blessings on his disciples, he was lifted from the earth and carried into heaven in the sight of all. The disciples fell down and worshipped the Lord,

* * * * *

you disciples] beginning from Jerusalem.' In the annotation *incipientibus* (on 24:47) he had defended the Vulgate's *incipientibus*, saying that the translator must have read a Greek genitive plural participle referring to the disciples, the appropriate reading in Erasmus' view, though he had not found it in his Greek manuscripts. See Fitzmyer AB Luke on the verse.

160 The exegetical tradition agrees that the *promissum patris* 'the promise(d one) of the Father' is the Holy Spirit; so Bede *In Lucam expos* PL 92 632C, followed by the interlinear *Gloss* (on 24:49), Hugh of St Cher (on 24:49) 276v, and Nicholas of Lyra (on 24:49). Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam* PG 123 1125A–B says the same thing and quotes the first part of the verse from Joel.

161 Cf Mark 16:20.

162 Cf 24:53, with Acts 1:14 and 2:46–7.

163 Cf Genesis 27 (Isaac) and 49 (Jacob), Deuteronomy 33 (Moses).

following him with their eyes as long as they could; but they followed him more with their hearts after his body had been taken from their sight.[164]

After these events they returned to Jerusalem, as the Lord had directed. But they returned with great joy. For now faith had driven out all grief, and certain hope in the promises added cheerfulness. And for the time being they were often in the temple, making the gospel sacrifices even then, extolling the graciousness of God towards the human race and giving thanks to him who had determined to bestow on mortals such great benefits through his Son without recompense.

* * * * *

164 Cf Acts 1:9–11 for the role of the observers in this verse.

This page intentionally left blank

THE SEQUENCE AND DATES OF THE PUBLICATION OF THE PARAPHRASES

WORKS FREQUENTLY CITED

SHORT-TITLE FORMS FOR ERASMUS' WORKS

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES CITED

INDEX OF GREEK AND LATIN WORDS CITED

GENERAL INDEX

The indexes refer primarily to the translator's note and the footnotes. Cf above, xi–xiv. An index of all the names and theological terms in the paraphrase itself is beyond the scope of this volume.

THE SEQUENCE AND DATES OF THE PUBLICATION OF THE PARAPHRASES

The Epistles

Romans	November 1517
Corinthians 1 and 2	February 1519
Galatians	May 1519
Timothy 1 and 2, Titus, Philemon	November / December 1519
Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians 1 and 2	January / February 1520
Peter 1 and 2, Jude	June / July 1520
James	December 1520
John 1–3, Hebrews	January 1521

Gospels and Acts

Matthew	March 1522
John	February 1523
Luke	August 1523
Mark	December 1523 / February 1524
Acts	February 1524

The Epistles were originally published by Dirk Martens in Louvain, except for Timothy, Tius, and Philemon, which were published by Michaël Hillen in Antwerp. The Gospels and Acts where all originally published by Johann Froben in Basel.

WORKS FREQUENTLY CITED

This list provides bibliographical information for the publications referred to in short-title form in introductions and notes. For Erasmus' writings see the short-title list following.

Allen	P.S. Allen, H.M. Allen, and H.W. Garrod eds *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami* (Oxford 1906–58) 11 vols plus index
Ambrose *Expos in Lucam*	Ambrosii Mediolanensis episcopi *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* PL 15 (Paris 1887) 1607–1944
ASD	*Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami* (Amsterdam 1969–)
AV	*The Holy Bible ... Authorized King James Version* (London [1611; repr 1969])
Bede *In Lucam expos*	Bedae *In Lucae evangelium expositio* PL 92 (Paris 1862) 301–634
Catena aurea	Thomae Aquinatis *Catena aurea in quatuor evangelia* ed A. Guarienti (Turin 1953) 2 vols
CCL	*Corpus christianorum, series Latina* (Turnhout 1953–)
Chrysostom *Hom in Matthaeum*	Joannis Chrysostomi *Homiliae in Matthaeum* PG 57 and 58 (Paris 1862) 21–472 and 21–794
CWE	Collected Works of Erasmus (Toronto 1974–)
Cyril *Expl in Lucam*	Cyrilli Alexandriae archiepiscopi *Explanatio in Lucae evangelium* PG 72 (Paris 1864) 475–950
DV	*The Holy Bible, Douay-Rheims Version,* rev Bishop Richard Challoner (1899; repr Rockford, IL 2000)
Ep	*Epistulae*
ERSY	*Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*
Fitzmyer AB Luke	*The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)* ed and trans Joseph A. Fitzmyer SJ, The Anchor Bible 28–28A (New York 1985) 2 vols
Gloss	*Glossa ordinaria,* in *Biblia Latina, cum Glossa ordinaria Walafridi aliorumque et interlineari Anselmi ... et cum postillis ac*

	moralitatibus Nicolai de Lyra ... ed Sebastian Brant (Basel: Johann Froben et Johann Petri, 1498) v
Gregory the Great *Hom in evang*	Gregorii Magni XL *Homiliae in evangelia* PL 76 (Paris 1849) 1075–1312
Hugh of St Cher	Hugo de Sancto Charo *In evangelia ... opus ... in quo declarantur sensus omnes* (Venice 1732) VI
interlinear *Gloss*	See *Gloss*
Jerome *Comm in Matthaeum*	Eusebii Hieronymi *Commentarii in evangelium Matthaei* PL 26 (Paris 1884) 15–228
Jerome *De nominibus Hebraicis*	Hieronymi *Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum* CCL 72 ed P. Antin (Turnhout 1959) 57–161
LB	*Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami opera omnia* ed J. Leclerc (Leiden 1703–6); repr Hildesheim 1961) 10 vols
LXX	*Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes* ed Alfred Rahlfs, 4th ed (Stuttgart 1950) 2 vols
Nestle-Aland	*Novum testamentum Graece et Latine.* Textum Graecum post Eberhard Nestle et Erwin Nestle communiter ediderunt Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Metzger, Allen Wikgren; Textus Latinus Novae Vulgatae Bibliorum Sacrorum Editioni debetur; utriusque textus apparatum criticum recensuerunt et editionem novis curis elaboraverunt Kurt Aland et Barbara Aland una cum Instituto studiorum textus Novi Testamenti Monasteriensi (Westphalia) (Stuttgart 1984)
Nicholas of Lyra	See *Gloss*
NRSV	*The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments with the Apocryphal Deuterocanonical Books, New Revised Standard Version* (New York 1989)
PG	*Patrologiae cursus completus ... series Graeca* ed J.-P Migne (Paris 1857–86) 162 vols
PL	*Patrologiae cursus completus ... series Latina* ed J.-P. Migne (Paris 1844–66) 221 vols
RSV	*The Holy Bible ... Revised Standard Version* (New York 1952)
Theophylact *Enarr in Lucam*	Theophylacti archiepiscopi Bulgariae *Enarratio in evangelium Lucae* PG 123 (Paris 1864) 683–1126

Valla *Annot in Lucam* Laurentii Vallensis *In evangelium Lucae Annotationes* in *Opera omnia* ed Eugenio Garin (Turin 1962) I 829–38

Vulg, Vulgate *Bibliorum sacrorum iuxta vulgatam clementinam nova editio ...* curavit Aloisius Gramatica (Vatican City 1946)

Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem, editio tertia emendata ed Robertus Weber, Bonifatius Fischer, H.I. Frede Johannes Gribomont, H.F.D. Sparkes, W. Thiele (Stuttgart 1983) 2 vols

SHORT-TITLE FORMS FOR ERASMUS' WORKS

Titles following colons are longer versions of the same, or are alternative titles. Items entirely enclosed in square brackets are of doubtful authorship. For abbreviations, see Works Frequently Cited.

Acta: Acta Academiae Lovaniensis contra Lutherum *Opuscula* / CWE 71
Adagia: Adagiorum chiliades 1508, etc (Adagiorum collectanea for the primitive form, when required) LB II / ASD II-1, 4, 5, 6 / CWE 30–6
Admonitio adversus mendacium: Admonitio adversus mendacium et obtrectationem LB X
Annotationes in Novum Testamentum LB VI / CWE 51–60
Antibarbari LB X / ASD I-1 / CWE 23
Apologia ad Caranzam: Apologia ad Sanctium Caranzam, or Apologia de tribus locis, or Responsio ad annotationem Stunicae ... a Sanctio Caranza defensam LB IX
Apologia ad Fabrum: Apologia ad Iacobum Fabrum Stapulensem LB IX / ASD IX-3 / CWE 83
Apologia adversus monachos: Apologia adversus monachos quosdam Hispanos LB IX
Apologia adversus Petrum Sutorem: Apologia adversus debacchationes Petri Sutoris LB IX
Apologia adversus rhapsodias Alberti Pii: Apologia ad viginti et quattuor libros A. Pii LB IX
Apologia contra Latomi dialogum: Apologia contra Iacobi Latomi dialogum de tribus linguis LB IX / CWE 71
Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo' LB IX
Apologia de laude matrimonii: Apologia pro declamatione de laude matrimonii LB IX / CWE 71
Apologia de loco 'Omnes quidem': Apologia de loco 'Omnes quidem resurgemus' LB IX
Apologiae contra Stunicam: Apologiae contra Lopidem Stunicam LB IX / ASD IX-2
Apologia qua respondet invectivis Lei: Apologia qua respondet duabus invectivis Eduardi Lei *Opuscula*
Apophthegmata LB IV
Appendix de scriptis Clithovei LB IX / CWE 83
Appendix respondens ad Sutorem LB IX
Argumenta: Argumenta in omnes epistolas apostolicas nova (with Paraphrases)
Axiomata pro causa Lutheri: Axiomata pro causa Martini Lutheri *Opuscula* / CWE 71

Carmina LB I, IV, V, VIII / ASD I-7 / CWE 85–6
Catalogus lucubrationum LB I / CWE 9 (Ep 1341A)
Ciceronianus: Dialogus Ciceronianus LB I / ASD I-2 / CWE 28
Colloquia LB I / ASD I-3 / CWE 39–40
Compendium vitae Allen I / CWE 4
Concionalis interpretatio (in Psalmi)
Conflictus: Conflictus Thaliae et Barbariei LB I
[Consilium: Consilium cuiusdam ex animo cupientis esse consultum] *Opuscula* / CWE 71

De bello Turcico: Consultatio de bello Turcico (in Psalmi)
De civilitate: De civilitate morum puerilium LB I / CWE 25
Declamatio de morte LB IV
Declamatiuncula LB IV
Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas: Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas sub nomine facultatis theologiae Parisiensis LB IX
De concordia: De sarcienda ecclesiae concordia, or De amabili ecclesiae concordia (in Psalmi)
De conscribendis epistolis LB I / ASD I-2 / CWE 25
De constructione: De constructione octo partium orationis, or Syntaxis LB I / ASD I-4
De contemptu mundi: Epistola de contemptu mundi LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 66
De copia: De duplici copia verborum ac rerum LB I / ASD I-6 / CWE 24
De esu carnium: Epistola apologetica ad Christophorum episcopum Basiliensem de interdicto esu carnium LB IX / ASD IX-1
De immensa Dei misericordia: Concio de immensa Dei misericordia LB V / CWE 70
De libero arbitrio: De libero arbitrio diatribe LB IX / CWE 76
De praeparatione: De praeparatione ad mortem LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 70
De pueris instituendis: De pueris statim ac liberaliter instituendis LB I / ASD I-2 / CWE 26
De puero Iesu: Concio de puero Iesu LB V / CWE 29
De puritate tabernaculi: De puritate tabernaculi sive ecclesiae christianae (in Psalmi)
De ratione studii LB I / ASD I-2 / CWE 24
De recta pronuntiatione: De recta latini graecique sermonis pronuntiatione LB I / ASD I-4 / CWE 26
De taedio Iesu: Disputatiuncula de taedio, pavore, tristicia Iesu LB V / CWE 70
Detectio praestigiarum: Detectio praestigiarum cuiusdam libelli germanice scripti LB X / ASD IX-1
De vidua christiana LB V / CWE 66
De virtute amplectenda: Oratio de virtute amplectenda LB V / CWE 29
[Dialogus bilinguium ac trilinguium: Chonradi Nastadiensis dialogus bilinguium ac trilinguium] *Opuscula* / CWE 7
Dilutio: Dilutio eorum quae Iodocus Clithoveus scripsit adversus declamationem suasoriam matrimonii / *Dilutio eorum quae Iodocus Clithoveus scripsit* ed Emile V. Telle (Paris 1968) / CWE 83
Divinationes ad notata Bedae LB IX

Ecclesiastes: Ecclesiastes sive de ratione concionandi LB V / ASD V-4, 5
Elenchus in N. Bedae censuras LB IX
Enchiridion: Enchiridion militis christiani LB V / CWE 66
Encomium matrimonii (in De conscribendis epistolis)
Encomium medicinae: Declamatio in laudem artis medicae LB I / ASD I-4 / CWE 29
Epistola ad Dorpium LB IX / CWE 3 / CWE 71
Epistola ad fratres Inferioris Germaniae: Responsio ad fratres Germaniae Inferioris ad epistolam apologeticam incerto autore proditam LB X / ASD IX-1
Epistola ad graculos: Epistola ad quosdam imprudentissimos graculos LB X
Epistola apologetica de Termino LB X
Epistola consolatoria: Epistola consolatoria virginibus sacris, or Epistola consolatoria in adversis LB V / CWE 69

Epistola contra pseudevangelicos: Epistola contra quosdam qui se falso iactant evangelicos LB X / ASD IX-1
Euripidis Hecuba LB I / ASD I-1
Euripidis Iphigenia in Aulide LB I / ASD I-1
Exomologesis: Exomologesis sive modus confitendi LB V
Explanatio symboli: Explanatio symboli apostolorum sive catechismus LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 70
Ex Plutarcho versa LB IV / ASD IV-2

Formula: Conficiendarum epistolarum formula (see De conscribendis epistolis)

Hyperaspistes LB X / CWE 76–7

In Nucem Ovidii commentarius LB I / ASD I-1 / CWE 29
In Prudentium: Commentarius in duos hymnos Prudentii LB V / CWE 29
Institutio christiani matrimonii LB V / CWE 69
Institutio principis christiani LB IV / ASD IV-1 / CWE 27

[Julius exclusus: Dialogus Julius exclusus e coelis] *Opuscula* / CWE 27

Lingua LB IV / ASD IV-1A / CWE 29
Liturgia Virginis Matris: Virginis Matris apud Lauretum cultae liturgia LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 69
Luciani dialogi LB I / ASD I-1

Manifesta mendacia CWE 71
Methodus (see Ratio)
Modus orandi Deum LB V / ASD V-1 / CWE 70
Moria: Moriae encomium LB IV / ASD IV-3 / CWE 27

Novum Testamentum: Novum Testamentum 1519 and later (Novum instrumentum for the first edition, 1516, when required) LB VI

Obsecratio ad Virginem Mariam: Obsecratio sive oratio ad Virginem Mariam in rebus adversis, or Obsecratio ad Virginem Matrem Mariam in rebus adversis LB V / CWE 69
Oratio de pace: Oratio de pace et discordia LB VIII
Oratio funebris: Oratio funebris in funere Bertae de Heyen LB VIII / CWE 29

Paean Virgini Matri: Paean Virgini Matri dicendus LB V / CWE 69
Panegyricus: Panegyricus ad Philippum Austriae ducem LB IV / ASD IV-1 / CWE 27
Parabolae: Parabolae sive similia LB I / ASD I-5 / CWE 23
Paraclesis LB V, VI
Paraphrasis in Elegantias Vallae: Paraphrasis in Elegantias Laurentii Vallae LB I / ASD I-4
Paraphrasis in Matthaeum, etc (in Paraphrasis in Novum Testamentum)
Paraphrasis in Novum Testamentum LB VII / CWE 42–50
Peregrinatio apostolorum: Peregrinatio apostolorum Petri et Pauli LB VI, VII

Precatio ad Virginis filium Iesum LB V / CWE 69
Precatio dominica LB V / CWE 69
Precationes: Precationes aliquot novae LB V / CWE 69
Precatio pro pace ecclesiae: Precatio ad Dominum Iesum pro pace ecclesiae LB IV, V / CWE 69
Psalmi: Psalmi, or Enarrationes sive commentarii in psalmos LB V / ASD V-2, 3 / CWE 63–5
Purgatio adversus epistolam Lutheri: Purgatio adversus epistolam non sobriam Lutheri LB X / ASD IX-1

Querela pacis LB IV / ASD IV-2 / CWE 27

Ratio: Ratio seu Methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam (Methodus for the shorter version originally published in the Novum instrumentum of 1516) LB V, VI
Responsio ad annotationes Lei: Liber quo respondet annotationibus Lei LB IX
Responsio ad collationes: Responsio ad collationes cuiusdam iuvenis gerontodidascali LB IX
Responsio ad disputationem de divortio: Responsio ad disputationem cuiusdam Phimostomi de divortio LB IX / CWE 83
Responsio ad epistolam Pii: Responsio ad epistolam paraeneticam Alberti Pii, or Responsio ad exhortationem Pii LB IX
Responsio ad notulas Bedaicas LB X
Responsio ad Petri Cursii defensionem: Epistola de apologia Cursii LB X / Allen Ep 3032
Responsio adversus febricitantis libellum: Apologia monasticae religionis LB X

Spongia: Spongia adversus aspergines Hutteni LB X / ASD IX-1
Supputatio: Supputatio calumniarum Natalis Bedae LB IX

Tyrannicida: Tyrannicida, declamatio Lucianicae respondens LB I / ASD I-1 / CWE 29

Virginis et martyris comparatio LB V / CWE 69
Vita Hieronymi: Vita divi Hieronymi Stridonensis *Opuscula* / CWE 61

This page intentionally left blank

Index of Scriptural Passages Cited

Genesis
1:26–7 165 n32, 74 n13
3:17, 18 262
9:6 165 n32
14:18 246 n60
22:1–14 264 n120
27 278 n163
35:19–20 255 n91
37 261 n107
37:2 261 n107
37:18 261 n107
46:30 131 n5
49 278 n163
49:9 268 n135
49:10 254
49:26 252

Exodus
12:46 266
20:4 128 n41
20:11 226 n64
25 118 n8
29:4 20 n56
29:40 189 n17
30:17–21 21 n56
30:22–33 241 n41
37 118 n8

Leviticus
4–6 240 n39
4:1–21 264 n122
11–17 21 n56
13 240 n39
13:1–46 110 n15
14:2–32 110 n15
16:14 118 n8
20:1–4 130 n1
26:1 128 n41

Numbers
6 252 n82
7:89 118 n8
11:12–14 238 n35
21:6–9 265 n123
28 189 n17

Deuteronomy
18:15 236
18:18 237
28:66 265
32:35 161 n21
33 278 n163
33:17 267

Judges
6:21 228 n8
15:19 101 n32

1 Samuel
2:35 246
2:36 247
15:12 147 n45
15:29 147 n45
16:23 101 n32
30:12 101 n32

2 Samuel
7:5 243 n50
7:12 243 n50
7:13 243 n50

7:16 243 n51
11 243 n52
16:14 101 n32
23:16 189 n17

1 Kings
8:19 243 n50
9:7–9 245 n57
11 243 n52

2 Kings
3:27 130 n1
12:9 172 n2
17 255 n90

2 Chronicles
24:20–2 25 n65
28:3 130 n1

Job
2:7 99 n26
12:24 264 n117

Psalms
2:1–2 259
2:6 249
2:7 256 n93
4 77 n19
4:5 246–7
16:10 268
18:43–4 245
22:6 262
22:6–8 266
22:16–17 266
22:18 266
23:5 101 n34
31:5 266 n130
38:11 258
38:13–14 221 n48
38:13–15 261
41:9 258
45:2–4 250 n73
45:3–4 249
45:5 250 n73
45:7 241
46:2–3 (45:4 Vulg) 180 n22, 180 n23
50:8–13 241 n43
50:14–15 246
50:23 246, 246 n63
51:16–17 2 n2
55:12–13 258
55:21 258
63:2 183 n30
65:7 (64:8 Vulg) 180 n22, 180 n23
69:21 265
69:25 259 n104
72:10 255, 255 n90
72:15 254, 255 n90
76:1–2 143 n32
78:2 256
80:8–16 160 n18
88:8 (87:9 Vulg) 257
92:2 Vulg 96 n17
96:10 267 n131
104:15 33 n19, 272 n142
104:17 52 n18
104:30 278
106:35–8 130 n1
109:2–4 266
109:8 259 n104
110:4 245
118:22 242
118:26 148 n46
119:105 19 n52
120:4 250, 250 n73
125:1–2 244 n56
129:3 261
132:11 252
141:2 2 n2

Proverbs
6:23 19 n52

Song of Solomon
2:13 135 n15
3:11 262

Isaiah
1:11 241
1:23 117 n3
1:26 243
1:26–7 242
2:2–3 244
2:3 237 n34
2:4–5 245
3:9 Vulg 259 n105

3:9b–10 LXX 259 n105
3:13–14 259
5:1–7 160 n18
5:4, 7 257
6:9–10 256
7:14 253, 255 n90
7:16 254 n89
8:4 254 n89, 255 n90
9:1–2 256 n94
9:2 96 n16
9:5–7 249
9:6 249 n72, 264
11:1–2 252
11:4–6 249
13:10 180 n22
14:12 3 n6
28:16 242
29:13 245 n59
35:4–6 256
37:19 77 n19
40:3–5 157 n7, 256 n93
42:1 256 n93
42:1b–4 238
44:9–20 77 n19
50:5–6 262 n108
53:1 256
53:2–5 262
53:2–3 262 n109
53:4–6 72 n7
53:4 72 n7, 256
53:7 261, 266 n128
53:9 247 n65
53:12 265
57:1–2 268 n134
57:1b–2a 268 n134
60:6 254
60:19 226 n66
61:1–3 238
61:1 241
61:3 101 n34
65:2 257
66:12–13 238 n35

Jeremiah

2:27 128 n41
4:3–4 238
4:4 241 n44
5:28 117 n3
7:4 170 n43
7:25 24 n63
11:18–19 260 n106
12:7–8 263
22:23 52 n18
23:24 160 n19
24 135 n15
31:15 255
31:31–2 239
31:33 239
31:34 239
48:28 52 n18

Lamentations

1:11 101 n32
1:19 101 n32
3:30 261
3:53 268
3:59–63 260
4:20 261

Ezekiel

2:8 245 n58
22:5 147 n45
44:2–3 253

Daniel

2:31–45 253 n84
9, 11, and 12 241 n42
9:20–7 178 n19
9:24–5 254 n86
9:24 240
9:27 241

Hosea

1:10 245
2:23 245
6:2 269
6:6 73 n10, 241 n43
11:1 255 n92

Joel

1:9 189 n17
1:13 189 n17
2:10 180 n22
2:28 278
2:31 180 n22, 176 n12
3:15 180 n22

Amos
8:9 265

Micah
5:2 252 n78
6:3–4 24 n63

Habakkuk
2:4 18 n50
3:4–5 267

Zechariah
9:9 248
9:10 249
11:12–13 258 n103
11:12 186 n8
12:10 276 n153
13:7 257
14:6–7 265

Malachi
1:10–11 247

Tobit
11:16–17 Vulg 131 n5

Judith
7:7 101 n32

Wisdom of Solomon
2:12 259 n105

Ecclesiasticus
32:1–2 192 n26
35:14–15 117 n3

Baruch
3:35–7 254

Matthew
2:2 254 n88
2:4–6 252 n78
2:11 254 n88
2:13–15 255 n92
2:15 255 n92
2:16–18 252 n79
2:19–23 252 n80, 255 n92
3:2 12 n34
3:7 157 n6
3:9 201 n52
3:11 159 n12
4:13 256 n95
4:15–16 256 n94
5–7 240 n40
5:1–48 237 n33
5:13 69 n36
5:15–16 39 n35
5:17 26 n66, 97 n20
5:25 45 n50
5:31–2 240 n40
5:33–7 240 n40
5:36 36 n27
5:38–42 240 n40
6 4 n7, 37 n32
6:1 22 n57
6:5–8 3 n4
6:5 3 n3
6:6 2 n2
6:7 3 n3
6:8 9 n23
6:9–13 4 n7
6:18 2 n2
6:33 37 n32
7:7 107 n7
7:11 10 n27
7:13–14 123 n25
7:13 54 n23
7:21 22 n59, 56 n26
7:22 56 n26
7:24–7 242 n48
8:5–13 107 n7
9:2 240 n39
9:13 73 n10, 247
9:34 257 n99
10:6 139 n25
10:16 171 n46
10:26 41 n39
10:34 250 n73
10:38 264 n118
11:2–6 257 n96
11:13 239 n36
11:28–30 238
11:30 78 n23, 150 n54
12:1–2 239 n38
12:7 73 n10
12:22–4 10 n28

12:24 257 n99
12:28 13 n36
12:38–40 269 n136
12:38 269 n137
12:39–40 17 n47
12:44 15 n41
13:10–13 32 n16
13:16 132 n7
13:31 52 n18
13:32 52 n17, 52 n18
13:33 52 n19
13:55 29 n8, 132 n7
14:22–5 183 n29
14:27 274 n149
15:1–6 21 n56
15:4–6 139 n22, 155 n68
15:14 240
15:21–8 99 n27
15:24 139 n25
15:28 107 n7
16:16–17 132 n7
16:18 242 n48
16:19 150 n52
17:14–21 107 n7
18:15 106 n6
18:18 150 n52
18:20 231 n20
18:21–2 45 n49
19:1–9 237 n33
19:3–9 240 n40
19:8 98 n22
19:13 120 n15
19:16–22 138 n22
19:16 122 n22
19:18 122 n23
19:24 54 n24
19:25–6 124 n27
19:27 124 n28
20:29–34 131 n3
21:1–3 187 n12
21:2 146 n40
21:5 248 n70
21:8 147 n44
21:9 148 n46
21:15–16 148 n47
21:18–19 135 n15
21:22 107 n7
21:33 160 n16, 257 n97
22:15–22 74 n13, 208 n4
22:16 164 n28
22:29 167 n35
22:34–8 169 n39
22:41–2 252 n83
22:42 169 n40
23:4 23 n62
23:7 22 n59
23:27 23 n60
23:30–7 262 n111
23:35 25 n65
23:37 57 n32, 238 n35
23:38 244
24:12 204 n63
24:15–31 178 n19
24:15 178 n19
24:23–5 133 n11
24:23 175 n9, 244 n54
24:24 116 n1
24:29 180 n25
24:30–1 248 n71
24:32 181 n26
24:36 113 n24
24:40 115 n28
24:41 115 n27
25:31 248 n71
25:34–46 102 n35
25:34–40 63 n18
26:5 185 n5
26:7 225 n62
26:12–13 224 n57
26:14–16 185 n6
26:15 186 n8
26:26–8 248 n67
26:30 Vulg 197 n40
26:31 257
26:34 194 n34
26:39 199 n46
26:47 200 n50
26:48 200 n51, 258
26:49 258
26:50 201 n55, 258 n101
26:52 202 n57
26:56 203 n59
26:57 202 n58, 203 n59
26:58 203 n59, 204 n61
26:59–61 165 n29
26:60–1 261 n107

26:70 195 n34
26:72 204 n61, 257 n100
26:73 204 n61
26:74 204 n61
27:3–9 186 n8
27:3–7 258 n102
27:6 172 n2
27:9–10 258 n103
27:15–21 213 n22
27:15–17, 21 213 n21
27:24 214 n27, 260
27:25 260
27:27–31 214 n29
27:28 211 n15
27:32 214–15 n29
27:33 217 n38
27:34 265 n126
27:41–3 220 n44
27:43 266 n127
27:51 222 n51
27:59 224 n59
27:60–6 227 n2
27:60 225 n60
28:1–8 228 n8
28:2 227 nn4–5
28:5 228 n7
28:18 144 n35
28:20 246

Mark

2:23–4 239 n38
3:22 257 n99
4:22 41 n39
4:31–2 52 n18
4:31 52 n17
4:32 52 n18
6:3 29 n8, 56 n26
7:1–13 21 n56, 155 n68
7:1–5 20 n55
7:6 245 n59
7:11 172 n2
9:14–29 107 n7
10:2–12 237 n33
10:13 120 n15
10:14 121 n17
10:17–22 138–9 n22
10:19 122 n23
10:24–7 124 n27
10:25 54 n24
10:28 124 n28
10:51 22 n59
11:4 146 nn40–1
11:8 147 n44
11:9 148 n46
11:10 148 n46
12:1 160 n16, 257 n97
12:13–17 74 n13, 208 n4
13:21 133 n11, 244 n54
13:25 180 n25
13:28 181 n26
13:32 113 n24
14:2 185 n5
14:3 225 n62
14:8 224 n57
14:30 194 n34
14:43 200 n50
14:44 200 n51
14:45 22 n59
14:55–9 165 n29
14:57–8 261 n107
14:58 241 n43
14:72 204 n62
15:6–11 213 n22
15:6–9 213 n21
15:16–20 214 n29
15:21 215 n29
15:22 217 n38
15:23 265 n126
15:39 222 n54
15:40 229 n11
15:44–5 224 n59
15:46 225 n60, 227 n2
16:1 227 n1
16:2 228 n8
16:3 227 n3
16:5 227 n5
16:6 228 n7
16:13 274 n148
16:17 12 n32
16:20 278 n161

Luke

1:38 228 n8
1:51–3 250 n73
1:52 62 n15
1:79 96 n16

2:1–7 252 n79
2:22–4 252 n81
2:25–32 131 n5
2:39–40 210 n11
3:2–18 157 n7
3:8 201 n52, 245 n59
3:9 48 n6
3:15 158 n9, 255 n93
3:22 256 n93
4:5–8 152 n59
4:6 141 n28
4:16–22 56 n26
4:18–21 246 n62
5:8 137 n18
5:11 124 n28
5:12–16 240 n39
5:16 2 n2
5:17–26 240 n39
5:33–5 239 n38
5:37 95 n14
5:39 95 n14
6:12 2 n2
6:20–49 240 n40
6:20–38 107 n8
6:23 107 n8
6:27–36 240 n40
6:27–8 118 n6
6:35 107 n8
6:46 22 n59
6:47–9 242 n48
7:1–10 107 n7
7:6–7 137 n18
7:19–22 257 n96
7:34 29 n8
7:36–50 224 n57, 240 n39
7:47 240 n39
8:3 229 n11
8:5–15 257 n98
8:9–10 32 n16
8:11 109 n10
8:55 276 n154
9:1 107 n7
9:9 132 n6
9:12–17 197 n38
9:23 56 n26, 215 n32
9:28–36 183 n29
9:28 2 n2
9:32 198 n41
9:37–43 107 n7
9:49–50 12 n32
10 2 n1
10:18 3 n6, 56 n26
10:23–4 132 n7
10:25–37 102 n35
10:25–7 169 n39
10:30–7 139 n22
10:31 129 n42
11 28 n6
11:1 3 n3
11:8 8 n19
11:9 107 n7
11:14–20 148 n48
11:15 257 n99
11:29–32 269 n136
11:38 155 n68
11:42 155 n68
11:44 23 n60
12–16 9 n22
12:1 28 n6, 126 n32
12:2 41 n39
12:3 35 n25
12:10 29 n10
12:16–21 92 n11
12:22–31 53 n21
12:33–4 53 n21
12:33 45 n49
12:37 192 n26
12:58–9 53 n21
13:4–5 46 n2
13:6–9 135 n15, 257 n98
13:15–16 51 n13
13:19 108 n10
13:24–30 66 n28
13:24 123 n25
13:34 150 n54, 153 n61, 238 n35, 262 n111
14:15–24 56 n26, 137 n19
15:23–4 33 n19
16 105 n1
16:1–8 34 n20
16:13 56 n26
16:16 56 n26, 239 n36
16:29 237 n33
16:31 237 n33
17:1–2 105 n1

17:3–4 107 n8
17:6 133 n10
17:10 140 n26
17:22–36 116 n2
17:23 133 n11, 244 n54
18:5 117 n5
18:9–14 134 n14
18:10–12 3 n3
18:11–12 138 n21
18:18–23 138 n22
18:22 45 n49, 107 n8
18:24 123 n25
18:25 54 n24, 126 n32
18:28 124 n28
18:35–43 130 n2, 130–1 n3
18:42 126 n34
19:9 131 n3
19:14 144 n35
19:30–4 187 n12
19:30 150 n52
19:33 150 n52
19:38 148 n46
19:40 201 n52
19:41–4 241 n42
19:41 57 n31
20:9–16 24 n63, 257 n97, 264 n121
20:17 242 n47
20:21–5 74 n13
20:24–5 208 n3
21:20–4 216 n35
22:15 188 n15, 263 n112
22:17 188 n15
22:18–20 248 n67
22:18 266
22:20 188 n15
22:28–30 56 n26
22:34 194 n34, 257 n100
22:36–9 250 n73
22:39–46 183 n29
22:41–4 43 n44
22:46 198 n41
22:48 258 n101
22:52 185 n6
22:54–60 257 n100
22:56 203 n59
22:62 82 n33
22:66 203 n59
23:1–5 165 n29
23:2 208 n3
23:8 132 n6
23:11 132 n6
23:12 264 n117
23:21 259
23:26–38 217 n36
23:26 214 n29
23:34 266 nn128–9
23:36 265 n126
23:38 220 n46
23:46 266
23:47 111 n17
23:49 266 n130
24:21 112 n23
24:53 278 n162

John

1:9 19 n52
1:10 135 n16
1:13 24 n63
1:17 237 n33
1:19–20 158 n9
1:26 112 n22
1:29–36 256 n93
1:48 132 n6, 136 n17
2:19 126 n32
2:20 173 n5
2:21–2 269 n137
3:1–15 72 n7
3:1–2 192 n27
3:14–15 132 n8
3:14 217 n39, 265 n123
3:29 262 n111
3:31 159 n13
4:1–2 157 n4
4:11 270 n139
4:20 3 n3
4:21–6 26 n66
4:21–4 173 n5
4:23 239 n37
4:32 126 n32
4:35–8 38 n34
5:45–7 237 n33
5:45–6 26 n66
6:15 208 n3
6:30–51 237 n33
6:42 56 n26

6:53 126 n32
6:66 192 n27
7:19–24 51 n13
7:50 192 n27
8:12 245 n59, 265 n124
8:31–47 139 n24
8:34–5 56 n26
8:39–44 50 n12
8:44 24 n63
8:48 29 n8
9:5 265 n124
10:11–18 72 n7
10:12–13 72 n8
10:15 247 n65
10:16 245
12:1–2 276 n154
12:4–6 185 n6
12:7 224 n57
12:12–13 147 n44
12:13 148 n46
12:20 173 n5
12:24 52 n17, 109 n10, 169 n38
12:25–6 29 n7
12:32 132 n8, 145 n37, 217 n39, 265 n123, 267
12:34–6 265 n124
12:47 248 n70
13 192 n26
13:18 258
13:29 128 n37
13:34 192 n26
14:2–3 193 n28
14:18–21 269 n137
14:26 8 n21
14:27 43 n45
15:12 192 n26
15:14–15 80 n28
15:16 247
15:18–21 177 n15
16:13 8 n21
16:16–23 269 n137
17:6–8 41 n39
18:3 200 n50
18:10 202 n56
18:11 202 n57
18:14 202 n58
18:15–27 204 n61
18:18 203 n59
18:22–3 204 n61
18:26 204 n61
18:36 208 n6
18:40 213 n22
19:1–3 214 n29
19:2 211 n15
19:15 144 n34, 151 n55, 259, 263
19:17 215 n29, 217 n38
19:19 252 n80
19:20 220 n46
19:23–4 266 n129
19:37 276 n153
19:38–9 72 n7, 224 n58
19:39 192 n27
19:40–1 224 n59
19:41 225 n60
20:5–7 230 n15
20:12 227 n5
20:16 22 n59
20:19–24 275 n151
20:19 229 n9
21:15–17 155 n66
21:22 142 n31

Acts of the Apostles

Acts 25 n64
1:6 112 n23
1:7 113 n24
1:9–11 279 n164
1:14 278 n162
1:20 259 n104
2 224 n58
2:2–12 8 n21
2:13 200 n48
2:20 176 n12
2:22–41 218 n40
2:30–1 226 n65
2:46–7 278 n162
2:46 12 n33
3:14 242 n45
3:22–3 237 n33
4:27 246 n62
5 46 n2
5:37 46 n2
5:40 144 n34

7:17–53 237 n33
7:52 161 n20
10 138 n20
10:38 246 n62
10:42 248 n71
11:1–3 138 n20
12:10 228 n8
15 86 n42
16:18 12 n32
17:29 77 n19
21:10 86 n42
22:10 86 n42
22:14 242 n45
23:8 166 n33

Romans
1–2 77 n19
1:1 166 n33
1:12 272 n145
1:17 18 n50
1:23 77 n19
2:11 164 n28
2:29 241 n44
3:10–20 118 n7
5:15–21 13 n36
8:15–17 193 n29
8:15 56 n26
8:35 28 n6
9:29 160 n18
10:16 152 n58
11:13–24 135 n15
11:25–6 179 n21
11:26 143 n33
12:19 161 n21
14:23 19 n53

1 Corinthians
1:18–30 135 n15
1:21–5 251 n75
1:23 105 n1
3:12–13 42 n43
4:13 193 n30
4:9 68 n31
5:7 186 n10, 218 n40
5:8 184 n4
6:1–4 45 n49
7:29 38 n34
12:21 2 n1
12:26 73 n11
15:33 70 n2, 232 n21
15:35–8 109 n10
15:36–54 169 n38
15:45 262 n110

2 Corinthians
1:21 246 n62
2:14 147 n45, 267 n132
3:7–18 237 n33
3:14–16 134 n13
3:18 121 n19, 126 n35
9:6 38 n34
10:4 251 n76

Galatians
2:1–10 86 n42
2:7–9 150 n51
3:11 18 n50
3:26–4:7 56 n26
4 193 n29
6:7–9 38 n34

Ephesians
2:14–15 243 n49
2:19 76 n17
2:20–2 242 n46
2:21 174 n6
5:5 170 n44
5:18 77 n21
6:5 12 n33
6:9 164 n28
6:12 249 n72
6:14–17 250 n74
6:17 195 n35, 197 n39

Philippians
2:8 213 n23, 248 n68
3:9 18 n50
3:19 128 n41

Colossians
1:20 243 n49
2:15 147 n45, 217 n36, 267 n132
3:1 104 n43
3:22 12 n33
3:25 164 n28

2 Thessalonians
1:7 248 n71
2:2 38 n34

1 Timothy
1:15 139 n25
6:10 128 n41

2 Timothy
4:1 248 n71

Hebrews
Hebrews 237 n33
2:17 246 n61
4–8 218 n40
4:2–3 56 n26
7:1–3 246 n60
8:5 189 n18
9:5 118 n8
9:12 189 n21, 246 n61
9:13 189 n21
9:19 189 n21
9:23–10:18 189 n18
9:26 189 n20
9:28 218 n40
10:10 189 n20
10:12–14 246 n61
10:38 18 n50
12:2 213 n23
12:3 213 n23
12:9 10 n27
13:14 270 n138

James
2:1, 9 164 n28
4:3 9 n24
5:4 160 n18

1 Peter
1:17 164 n28
2:5 242 n46
2:22 247 n65
2:24–5 72 n7
2:24 72 n7
2:25 139 n25
3:18 189 n20, 226 n65

2 Peter
2:4 3 n6
2:19 128 n41
2:21 14 n39

1 John
2:2 218 n40, 246 n61
4:18 43 n44

Jude
6 3 n6

Revelation
6:12 176 n12
12:9 3 n6
13:34 150 n54
21 150 n54
21:23 226 n66
22:5 226 n66

This page intentionally left blank

Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited

GREEK WORDS

(ἀπ᾽) ἀγροῦ 215 n30
ἀγών 199 n44
αἴρειν 196 n37
αἰτία, αἴτιον 209 n7, 212 n18
ἀναβλέψας 172 n1
ἀναίδεια 8 n19
ἀνακῦψαι 49 n8
ἀπολογήσεσθε 30 n11
(ἐν) ἀπορίᾳ 180 n23
ἀποστοματίζειν, ἀποστομίζειν 26 n67
ἀστραπτούσῃ 227 n5
ἀσωτία 77 n21
ἄτεκνος 166 n34
αὐτά [παιδία] 121 n17
αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει 146 n42

βάτος 90 n5
βίος 76 n16, 173 n3

γαμεῖν 167 n36
γράμμα 90 n6

διαλλάσσειν 264 n117
διαφέρειν 35 n26
δοξάζων 111 n17

(ἀφ᾽) ἑαυτῶν 181 n26
ἐδαφιοῦσιν 154 n64
εἰ 53 n21
εἰσελθεῖν 123 n26
ἐκεῖθεν 102 n37
ἐκείνης 132 n9
ἐκλίπετε 92 n9
(τὰ) ἔνοντα 21 n57
ἐντός 112 n22
ἐξεκρέματο 155 n67
ἐπέστησαν 156 n2
ἐπί (ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν) 68 n32
(τὸ) ἐπιβάλλον 76 n16
ἐπιούσιον 6 n12
ἐπισκοπή 154 n65
ἐπιστομίζειν 26 n67
ἔσονται 55 n26
εὐτόνως 210 n14
εὐφραίνεσθαι 83 n36
ἔχω 64 n19

(ὁ) ἡγούμενος 191 n25
ἡσύχασαν 225 n63

καί 95 n14
καταξιώθητε 182 n28
κρανίου τόπος 217 n38
κώμη 110 n14
κωφός 10 n28

λόγος x

μετανοεῖν 17 n46
μετανοήσει 106 n5
μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε 37 n30
μήποτε 182 n27

οἰκονόμος 88 n2
ὄρνις 57 n32
οὐσία 76 n16

παῖδες 148 n47
παιδεύσας 214 n25
(*τὰ*) *παιδία* 7 n17, 121 n17
παραθεῖναι 222 n53
παραιτεῖσθαι 65 n23
παροικεῖς 232 n24
πεπεισμένος ἐστίν 159 n14
πίστις 36 n29
προβάλωσιν 181 n26
προσψαύειν 24 n62

στρατηγοί 185 n6
συκαμίνος 133 n10
συκομορέα 133 n10
συκομορος 135 n15
συνοχή 180 n23

τελειοῦμαι 57 n29
τίνα . . . τὸν πατέρα 9 n25

χάσμα 102 n37
χόρος, χορεύει 85 n39
(*ὁ*) *χρίστος* 246 n62

LATIN WORDS

abrogari 97 n19
accipere 164 n28
acetum 265 n126
acriter 210 n14
ad (ad se) 68 n32
advena 232 n24
advenam mundi 76 n17
aenigma 14 n38
agonia 199 n44
alabastrum 225 n62
alba 211 n15
an 53 n21
angor 199 n44
angusta porta 123 n25
anima 35 n24
ansam captatam 165 n30
antecellere 35 n26
antiquari 97 n19
anxietas 180 n23
arbor morus 133 n10
argumentum 70 n3
attingere 23 n62

baptizare 20 n55
bellum suscipere 43 n47
bubulcus 109 n12

caeteri homines, hominum 119 n9
Calvariae locus 217 n38
capit 57 n30
caro legis 20 n56
castellum 110 n14
castigare 214 n25
causa, causae 209 n7, 212 n18, 214 n24
cautio 91 n6
cellarium 35 n25
certus 159 n14
chaos 102 n37
chorus 85 n39
christis 246 n62, 247 n66
cito 83 n35
codicilli 90–1 n6
cœperat 230 n14
cogitando 36 n27
colloquium 272 n143
commendare 222 n53
commodare 7 n16

concurrere 16 n44
condonare 6 n13
confabulari, confabulatio 230 n16, 235 n29, 270 n139, 272 n143
conquieverant 225 n63
consentaneum (-eam) 51 n14
constanter 210 n14
consummasset 78 n22
consummor 57 n29
consumpsisset 78 n22
contemnere 43 n47
contendere cum 18 n48
convenerunt 156 n2
convenit 57 n30
cornuta interrogatio 158 n10
coros 90 n5
corripere 214 n25
crassus x, 33 n16
crimen, criminis 209 n7, 212 n18, 214 n24
crimen pessimum 261 n107
crux, cruciatus 199 n45
cuique suum 40 n37
cuniculos 163 n25

deflexa et contracta 48 n8
deglubere 155 n66
delatus est 89 n3
deposuisse 222 n53
deridebant 95 n15
desperatio 180 n23
die quodam 156 n1
diffamatus est 89 n3
diluculo ventitabat 183 n30
dimitte, dimittere 6 n13, 266 n128
dispensator, dispensatio 89 n2
disponere 193 n28
dissidium habere 43 n47
diu 117 n4, 160 n17
dividi 43 n47
divortium 76 n17
dominus, domine x, 42 n41, 160 n19, 169 n41, 270 n139
dux 191 n25, 235 n30, 248 n69

eam [pecuniam] 142 n30
efflagitabant 214 n28
emancipato 77 n20
emendatum 214 n25
epulari, epulemur 34 n19, 83 n36
eradicare 108 n9
erogare 33 n18
etiam 47 n4
evangelicus x
evehere, evecti 62 n16
everret 73 n12
evertit 73 n12
exanimari 180 n24
exasperatrix 245 n58
excusare 65 n23
ex eo 96 n17
exercituum 160 n18
expeditae 179 n20
extabescere 180 n24

fabula, fabulari 185 n7, 230 n16, 270 n139
facinorosi 217 n37
facultatum 76 n16
familia 139 n23
fides x, 36 n29, 110 n16, 126 n34
fiducia x, 110 n16, 126 n34,
filii 166 n34
foenum 36 n28
forma 126 n35
(ad meliorem) frugem 103 n42

gaudeamus, gaudere, gaudium 83 n36
gazophylacium 172 n2
generatio 17 n45, 24 n63
glorificans 111 n17
Golgotha 217 n38
gratulari, gratulatio 83 n36

habent 63–4 n19
habitare 52 n18
harmonia 168 n37
herba 36 n28
hiatus 102 n37
histrio 170 n42,
honoratior 62 n14

ignosce, ignoscere 6 n13, 266 n128
illaqueat 198 n41
ille 220 n45
illos [pueros] 121 n17
imaginem 121 n19
imago 2 n1
impius x
improbitas 8 n19
inde 132 n9
ingredi 123 n26
inhiare 155 n67
inmisso capite prospiciens 230 n13
inmutat 264 n117
in novissimo 117 n4
inter vos 112 n22
intrare 123 n26
intra vos 112 n22
intueri 203 n60
invenire 111 n20
istinc, istuc 102 n37
iudicat 242 n45
iudicium 18 n50, 242 n45
iusti 242 n45
iustitia(m) 18 n50, 242 n45
iuvenes 148 n47

laetitia 83 n36
lavare 20 n55
libare, libatio 189 n17
liberi 166 n34
ludi solennes 61 n11
luxuria, luxus 77 n21

magistri nostri 61 n10
magnas 122 n21
mali confessionem 127 n36
mamma lactantibus 179 n20
mammon 92 n10
manicabat 183 n30
Martis aleam 68 n34
matres 120 n15
meliores 29 n6
mittere 52 n18
mundare 20 n55
mutuare 7 n16
mutus 10 n28

natio 17 n45, 24 n63
natum 33 n18
ne forte 182 n27
nequam 217 n37
nidificare 52 n18
nidulari 52 n18
nitidus 101 n34
nolebat nec 119 n11
nolite in sublimi tolli 37 n30
novus homo 157 n7
novus hospes 232 n24
nubere 167 n36
nullus repertus est 111 n20

oblectari 34 n19
oeconomus 88 n2
offendere, offendiculum 105 n1
oratio 30 n11, 272 n143

parare 193 n28
pascha 183 n2, 189 n16
patres patriae 191 n24
patria potestas 77 n20
pendere, pendebat 155 n67, 183 n1
penuarium 35 n25
perfectio 68 n35
per multum tempus 117 n4

persuasum habere 159 n14
petitionem 214 n28
phase 183 n2, 186 n10, 189 n16
picturae 23 n60
pius x
poenitentia 71 n6
poenitentiam agere 17 n46, 71 n6
potens 13 n36
praecessor 191 n25
praesidium 13 n36
praestare 35 n26
praeterire 129 n42
primas partes agere 185 n7
princeps 122 n21, 220 n44, 248 n69
procella 194 n31
prodegit 78 n22
profectio 68 n35
profudisset 78 n22
propitiatorium 118 n8
pueri 7 n17, 148 n47
pusillus 105 n1

quam multi 79 n26
quanti 79 n26
quasi dissipasset 89 n3
qui 221 n47
quinimo 16 n43
quot 79 n26

rabbini, rabboni 22 n59
recipere visum 128 n38
reconciliat 264 n117
recondere 92 n11
rector 191 n25
recusare 65 n23
refocillare 101 n32
reiectamenta mundi 193 n30
reinvitent 63 n17
remittere 6 n13
rependam 161 n21
reperire 111 n20
requiescere 52 n18
resipiscere x, 17 n46, 46n3, 71 n6
resipuerit 106 n5
respicere, respectus 164 n28, 172 n1

Sabaoth 160 n18
sal 69 n38
Salem 246 n60
sannae 95 n15
sarcina 23 n62, 54 n24, 179 n20
sata tria 52 n19
scandalum 105 n1
seminare 52 n18
serere 52 n18
sermo x, 5–6 n12, 15 n40, 19 n52, 42 n40, 60 n7, 195 n35, 234 n27, 237 n34, 272 n142
servatores 191 n24
servus x
si 53 n21
sicut puer 121 n20
siluerunt 225 n63
simplex, simplicitas 12 n33, 18 n49
simultatem exercere 43 n47
sollicitudine 36 n27
solo aequare 154 n64
solvere 150 n52
substantia 76 n16, 173 n3
sugillet 117 n5
(quod) superest 21 n57
sursum aspicere 49 n8
symphonia 85 n39

tandem 117 n4
tangere 23 n62
tempestas 194 n31
tentator 198 n41
testamentum 189 n19
tituli 23 n60
tollere 196 n37
traducere 267 n132

transfudere 229 n10
transire 123 n26
transitus 183 n2
transplantare 108 n9
tribus mensuris 52 n19
tribus verbis 128 n39
tristes 232 n22
triste vitium 31 n14
triumphator, triumphus 147 n45
tumultus 186 n9
turba 186 n9

ulcerosus 99 n26
uxorem ducere 167 n36

vapescere 69 n37
vel 47 n4
velut etiam 119 n10
verbum x, 19 n52, 195 n35, 237 n34, 244 n55
victus 173 n3
viculus 110 n14
villa 215 n30
villicatio, villicus 88 n2
viri evangelici 3 n5
virtus 13 n36
visitatio 154 n65

General Index

Alexander of Aphrodisias 168 n37
allegory 16 n42 (marvelling woman), 39 n35 (girded loins, burning lamps), 44 n47 (young over old), 48 n6 (fig), 49 n10 (bent-over woman), 53 n20 (mustard seed and yeast), 60 n8 and 62 (dropsy), 74 n14 (parable of prodigal son), 78–9 and n24 (husks for pigs), 85 n38 (elder son), 104 n43 (rich man), 108 n10 (mustard seed), 110 n15 (leprosy), 115 n27 (women at the mill), 116 n29 (corpse and eagles), 130 n3 (blind man, Zacchaeus), 130–7 (Zacchaeus), 135 and n15 (fig tree), 140 n28 (kingdom), 143–4 (kingdom), 143 n33 (slaves, pounds), 144 n34 (fellow citizens, enemies), 145 n37 (watchtower), 149–52 and 149 n50 (entry into Jerusalem), 159–62 (vineyard and owner), 162 n24 (cornerstone), 183–4 (Passover), 186 n10 (Paschal lamb), 187 n13 (jar of water), 215 n32 (Simon of Cyrene), 272 n142 (house, bread). *See also* analogy; metaphor
Ambrose *Expos in Lucam* xi, 253 n83 (on 3:23), 273 n147 (on 24), and passim
analogy 176 n13 (mortal illness and end of world), 209 n8 (effect of medicine on body and gospel on people), 215 n33 (women and the powerless), 226 n66 (creation and redemption). *See also* allegory; metaphor
angels 3 n6, 29 n9, 68 n31, 71 n6, 73 n11, 81, 81 n30, 92 n8, 180 n25, 227 n5, 228 n7, 274 n149
'anointed' 246 n62, 247 n66
apologists, early Christian 235 n31
apostles and bishops, good shepherd model for 72 n9. *See also* Jesus: prepares disciples and clergy for teaching and preaching
Aquinas. *See* Thomas Aquinas
Aristotle 87 n43, 168 n37
Athanasius 30 n10
atheism 129, 130 n1
Augustine
– *De consensu evangelistarum* xii, 13 n36, 202 n56, 204 n62, 220 n44, 274 n148
– *Enchiridion* 4 n8, 5 n12
– *Quaestiones evangeliorum* xii, 8 n19, 35 n23, 37 n30, 64 n20, 75 n14, 77 n19, 79 n24, 80 n29, 82 n34, 90 n4, 92 n8, 94 n13, 99 n25, 102 n35, 110 n15, 115 n27, 143 n33, 144 n34, 154 n63
– *Sermones de scripturis* xii, 5 n12, 7 nn15 and 17, 8 n20, 9 n23, 39 n35, 54 n23, 92 nn8 and 10, 98 n24, 100 n29, 119 nn8–9, 120 n12, 274 n150

Basil of Caesarea 32 n15, 34 n20
Beatus Rhenanus 58 n2, 236 n31
Béda, Noël 61 n10, 119 n8, 134 n12, 177 n16, 195 n36, 215 n34, 221 n50, 223 n56, 240 n40, 244 n53, 274–5 n151. *See also* critics of Erasmus, Catholic; Paris faculty of theology
Bede, the Venerable xi, xii; *In Marcum expos* 229 n12; *In Lucam expos* 253 n83, and passim
Beelzebub *See* Satan
Bethlehem 251–2
Bible, English texts of xiv
biblical text: errors in 65 n22, 73 n12, 78 n22, 79 n26; variants in 37 n32, 82 n34, 99 n27, 109 n12, 199 n47, 262 n109, 274 n149, 276 n155, 277 n159. *See also* Vulgate: *Paraphrase* accommodates; *Paraphrase* alters
bishops 60–1 n10, 156, 219. *See also* apostles and bishops, good shepherd model for; Jesus: prepares disciples and clergy for teaching and preaching

Caiaphas 259, 260
Cassius Dio 255 n90
catenae xii, xii n5
Celsus *De medicina* 60 n6, 133 n10
'Christ' 175 n9, 246 n62
Chrysostom. *See* John Crysostom
Cicero 89 n2, 157 n7, 191 n24; *De natura deorum* 77 n19, 130 n1; *De officiis* 163 n25; *De oratore* 201 n52; letters 108 n9, 231 n19; *Pro Caelio* 87 n43, 104 n42; *Tusculan Disputations* 168 n37
'Cleophas' 232 n23
Colet, John 199 n47
commerce and finance: language of 63–4, 90 n6, 92 n10; language of avoided 29 n6, 35 n26
contemporary life, allusions to 60 n10, 133, 134 n12, 144, 151, 155–6, 171–2, 191 n24, 201 n54
corban 155 n68, 172, 172 n2
courtesy 61 n12, 62 n13, 136, 192, 192 n26
Creeds, Apostles' and Nicene 104 n43, 248 n71
critics of Erasmus, Catholic 185 n7. *See also* Béda, Noël; Paris faculty of theology
Curtius Rufus 198 n40
Cyprian *Ad Quirinum testimonia* 236 n31, 249 n72, 259 n105, 260 n106, 268 n134
Cyril of Alexandria, commentary on Luke xi, xii and n5, and passim

Damascus 255 n90
David 243 and n52
declamation 235 n31
demons 78–9, 80 n27, 149
desire: for spiritual goods 78, 131–6; for worldly goods 78–9 and n24. *See also* wealth
Diogenes Laertius 130 n1
Dioscorides 135 n15
Donatus 231 n19
drama, effects of 80 n27, 82 n34, 139 n23, 152 n60, 185 n7, 231 n16. *See also* stage, language of the
dropsy 58 n2, 60 n6, 62

Ebionites 133 n11
Erasmus, pacifism of 177, 177 n16, 195, 195–6 nn36–7, 218–19
Erasmus, works edited by
– Cicero *De officiis* 163 n25
– Cyprian, works of 236 n31
– Jerome, works of 259 n105
– Seneca, works of 163 n25

Erasmus, original works of
- *Adagia* (I i 1) 71 n5; (I ii 4) 28 n4, 157 n5; (I ii 34) 57 n29; (I ii 42) 273 n146; (I iii 45) 215 n31; (I iii 84) 231 n18; (I iv 4) 165 n30, 206 n65, 209 n10; (I iv 30) 45 n1; (I vi 50) 30 n11; (I x 71) 211 n16; (I x 74) 70 n2, 76 n18, 232 n21; (II iii 74) 158 n11; (II vii 12) 207 n67; (III i 99) 263 n116; (III ii 75) 159 n15; (III iii 1) 5 n9; (III viii 56) 231 n19; (IV i 1) 196 n37; (IV v 50) 231 n19; (V ii 17) 201 n52
- *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum* xi, xiii, xiv
  Annotations on Matthew 4 n7, (2:6) 252 n78, (3:2) 17 n46, (4:15) 256 n94, (6:11) 5 n12, (6:12) 6 n13, (6:23) 18 n49, (13:33) 52 n19, (18:6) 105 n2, (23:2) 60 n10, (23:7) 22 n59, (23:35) 25 n65, (24:36) 123 n24, (27:8) 258 n103
  Annotations on Mark (14:30) 195 n34
  Annotations on Luke 4 n7, (1:27) 253 n83, and passim
  Annotations on John (1:1) 220 n45
  Annotations on Romans (1:1) 166 n33; (1:12) 272 n145; (1:17) 36 n29, 110 n16; (8:15) 22 n59; (9:28) 160 n18; (12:19) 161 n21
  Annotations on Hebrews (11:1) 110 n16
- *Apologia de 'In principio erat sermo'* 195 n35
- *Colloquies* (*Colloquia*) 134 n12, 188 n15
- *De libero arbitrio* 79 n25
- *De taedio Jesu* 199 n43, 200 n47
- *Declarationes* 195 n36, 216 n34, 232 n23, 240 n40, 244 n53
- *Detectio praestigiarum* 188 n15
- *Divinationes* 61 n10, 177 n16, 216 n34, 221 n50, 223 n56, 240 n40, 244 n53, 275 n151
- *Ecclesiastes* 13 n35
- *Elenchus* 275 n151
- *Enchiridion* 20 n56, 134 n12, 188 n15
- *Explanatio symboli* (*Explanation of the Apostles' Creed*) 4 n7, 253 n85
- *Expositions of the Psalms* (*Psalmi*) 5 n9, 77 n19, 188 n15, 246 n62
- *Institutio principis christiani* 196 n37
- letters (Ep 182) 89 n2, (Ep 1000) 236 n31, (Ep 1232) 236 n31, (dedication of the *Paraphrase on John*, Ep 1333) 133 n11, (Ep 1532) 176 n11, (Ep 2090) 147 n45, (Ep 2465) 261 n107, (Ep 2584) 83 n34, (Ep 2880) 69 n37, (Ep 2895) 69 n37
- *Life of Jerome* (*Vita Hieronymi*) 79 n24, 259 n105
- *Liturgy of the Virgin Mother as Venerated at Loreto* (*Liturgia Virginis Matris*) 253 n85
- *Moria*. See *Praise of Folly*
- *Modus orandi Deum* 4 n7
- *Novum Testamentum* 4 n7, 6 n13, 21 n57, 146 n41, 175 n9, 193 n30, 199 n44
- *Paean in Honour of the Virgin* (*Paean Virgini Matri*) 253 n85
- *Panegyricus* 196 n37
- *Paraclesis* 28 n5, 134 n13, 277 n158
- *Paraphrases*, 1548 English edition of 158 n10
- *Paraphrase on Matthew* 4 n7; (2) 254 n87; (5) 3 n5, 26 n66; (6) 5 n12; (13) 32 n16; (14) 188 n14; (19) 120 n15; (22) 74 n13, 165 n31; (24) 181 n25; (26) 195 n34; (27) 266 n127
- *Paraphrase on Mark* (1) 205 n64; (2) 28 n4; (5) 61 n11; (6) 72 n9; (12) 74 n13, 165 n31; (13) 180 n25
- *Paraphrase on Luke* 4 n7; classical influences on xi; conservative criticism of xiii; edition translated ix–x; goals of translation and

annotation x–xiii; historical setting characterized xi; interpretation by narrator (introductory) 3–4, 4 n7, 14–15, 18, 19–20, 48–9, 64–5, 88, 98, 108–9 and n11, 116 and n2, 140 and n27, 172, 234–5, (concluding) 62–3, 64, 71–3, 87–8, 104, 130 and n2, 143 and 33, 171–2; Leiden edition of (LB) x, xiv, 22 n59, 51 n14, 62 n16, 66 n26, 111 n17, 112 n21, 150 n53, 156 n3, 174 n8, 175 n10, 198 n42, 230 n14, 232 n23, 235 n31, 246 n63; medieval biblical exegesis in xi–xiii; other Gospels incorporated in (11) 3 nn3–4, 4 n8, 5 n11, 6 n14, 10 nn27–8, 15 n41, 23 n60; (12) 37 n32, 45 n50; (13) 52 n17, 54 n23, 56 n26; (14) 60 n9; (15) 73 n10; (16) 98 n22, 102 n35; (17) 113 n24, 115 n27; (18) 116 n1, 121 n17, 124 n27; (19) 132 n7, 144 n35, 146 nn40–1, 147 n44, 148 n46; (20) 159 nn12–13, 160 n16, 164 n28, 167 n35, 169 nn39–40; (22) 194–5 n34, 197 n40, 199 n46, 200 nn50–1, 201 n55, 202 nn56–8, 203 n59, 204 nn61–2; (23) 213 nn21–2, 214 n29, 217 n38, 222 n51, 224 nn57 and 59, 225 nn60 and 62, (24) 227 nn1–5, 230 n15; portion of Gospel omitted in 11 n29, 15 n41, 51 n15, 66 n25, 70 n1, 114 n26, 217 n38, 219 n44, 225 n61, 276 n156; publication history ix; texts used xiv; uncertain assignment of speaker in 54 n25, 66 n27, 69 n39, 91 n7, 160 n19, 263 n114; variant readings in 66 n26, 68 nn33 and 35, 86 n41, 111 n17, 112 n21, 114 n26, 150 n53, 156 n3, 174 n8, 175 n10, 198 nn41–2, 237 n32, 245 n57, 246 n63, 247 n64, 257 n96, 274 n151, 275 n152; verses reversed in 98 n21, 213 n22. *See also* Vulgate

references to other chapters of (1) 250 n73, 274 n149; (2) 253 n83; (3) 237 n33, 253 n83; (4) 141 n28, 152 n59; (5) 2 n2, 155 n68; (6) 2 n2; (8) 32 n16; (9) 2 n2, 188 n14, 272 n142; (10) 2 n1, 110 n13; (11) 28 n6, 29 n9, 37 n31, 44 n48, 171 n45; (12) 88 n43, 157 n5, 192 n26, 263 n113; (13) 32 n16, 59 n5, 108 n10, 153 n61; (14) 88 n1, 171 n45; (15) 130 n1, 152 n60; (16) 33 n16, 34 n20, 155 n68, 239 n36, 271 n140; (17) 32 n16, 52 n17, 190 n22; (18) 54 n24, 134 n14; (19) 77 n19, 217 n39, 227 n6, 263 n115, 271 n140, 272 n142, 277 n158; (20) 24 n63, 28 n4, 74 n13, 257 n97, 264 n121; (21) 276 n157; (22) 32 n16, 43 n44, 50 n10, 170 n42, 178 n16, 234 n25, 250 n73, 248 n67, 265 n125, 272 n142; (23) 32 n16, 227 n6, 238 n35, 263 n115, 266 n128, 266 n130, 267 n133; (24) 32 n16, 44 n48, 188 n15, 219 n41

– *Paraphrase on John* (1) 14 n38, 77 n19, 110 n13, 183 n2, 195 n35; (2) 17 n47, 262 n111; (3) 33 n16, 72 n7, 132 n8, 217 n39; (4) 2 n2, 14 n38, 26 n66, 33 n16, 97 n18, 110 n13, 173 n5, 184 n3, 239 n37, 244 n53, 255 n90, 270 n139; (5) 26 n66, 170 n43; (6) 2 n2, 5 n12, 14 n38, 72 n9, 188 n14, 188 n15, 208 n3, 271 n140, 272 n142, 274 n149; (7) 51 n13, 187 n13; (8) 27 n1, 50 n12, 139 n24, 244 n53; (9) 13 n35, 126 n33, 187 n13; (10) 72 n8, 72 n9; (11) 229 n11, 271 n140; (12) 13 n35, 29 n7, 132 n8, 145 n37, 173 n5, 217 n39, 224 n57, 229 n11, 276 n154; (13) 3 n5, 28 n4, 128 n37, 194 n32, 248 n67; (14) 8 n21, 198 n41, 200 n48; (15) 177 n15; (16) 8 n21; (17) 3 n5; (18) 194 n32, 196 n37, 204 n61, 214 n26; (19) 43 n44, 72 n7, 212 n20, 219 n43, 232 n23, 262 n108, 264 n119,

265 n126; (20) 227 n5, 228 n7, 230 n15, 274 n149; (21) 155 n66, 194 n32
– *Paraphrase on Acts* 20 n56; (1) 14 n38; (2) 8 n21, 17 n46, 188 n15, 226 n65; (3) 101 n32, 242 n45; (7) 139 n24; (15) 86 n42; (16) 145 n37; (17) 5 n9; (21) 86 n42; (22) 86 n42, 242 n45
– *Paraphrase on Romans* (1) 166 n33, 272 n145; (4) 139 n24; (5) 13 n36
– *Paraphrase on Galatians* 86 n42, 139 n24
– *Paraphrase on Ephesians* 174 n6
– *Paraphrase on 1 Timothy* 17 n46
– *Paraphrase on Hebrews* 10 n27, 14 n38
– *Paraphrase on 1 Peter* 226 n65
– *Paraphrase on 1 John* 12 n33
– *Paraphrasis in elegantias Vallae* 111 n20
– *Praise of Folly* (*Moria*) 134 n12, 196 n37
– *Precatio dominica* 4 n7
– *Precationes aliquot novae* 4 n7
– *Psalmi*. See *Expositions of the Psalms*
– *Purgatio* 185 n7
– *Querela pacis* 196 n37
– *Ratio verae theologiae* xi, 236 n31, 277 n158
– *Supputatio* 76 n17, 119 n8, 134 n12, 195 n36, 216 n34, 221 n50, 244 n53, 275 n151
Eucharist 5 n12, 116 n29, 188 n15, 248 n67, 272 n142
Eusebius: *Demonstratio evangelica* 252 n83; *Praeparatio evangelica* 77 n19
Eutropius 61 n12
'eyes of the mind' or 'of faith' 126 n33, 252

faith/trust 36 n29, 51 n16, 107 n7, 110 n16, 118 n6, 139 n24, 243–4; works of 107 n8. *See also* Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited: *fides, fiducia*; Jerusalem: spiritual
'flesh of the Law' 20 n56, 133, 149
Froben press ix, 236 n31, 259 n105

gentiles. *See* Jews: Jews and gentiles compared
'gloomy vice' 31 n14
Gloss (*Glossa ordinaria*): (on Matt 4:15) 256 n94; (on Luke) xii, xiii n6, and passim
gospel, causes revolution 209 and n8
grace 79 n25, 140 n27
grammar, in *Paraphrase*: cases, genders, numbers 69 n38, 115 n27, 119 n9, 120 n15, 142 n30, 189 n21, 194 n33, 224 n59; Latin idiom 63 n19, 79 n26, 113 n25, 119 nn10–11, 120 n13, 128 n39, 146 n42, 156 n1, 221 n47, 256 n94; tenses and moods 11 n31, 21 n57, 63 n19, 68 n33, 108 n9, 123 n25, 128 n38, 178 n18, 190 n21, 198 n41
greed 95 n14
Gregory of Nyssa: *De anima* 168 n37; *De virginitate* 74 n13
Gregory the Great: *Homiliae in evang* xii; (2) 127 n36, 128 n40, 129 n42, 131 n3; (23) 270 n139; (24) 229 n12; (34) 70 n4, 72 n7, 73 n9, 73 n11, 74 n13; (35) 176 n11, 177 n14; (36) 64 n20, 67 n28; (39) 153 nn60 and 63; *Moralia* 210 n13

harmony. *See* soul
healing 49 n9, 51 n13, 59 n5
heresy 110 n15, 133 n11
Herod 132 n6, 251, 254 n87, 255 n90, 261, 263–4
Herodotus 77 n19, 130 n1
Holy Spirit 8 n21, 10, 30 n10, 86–7, 194, 224 n58; gift of at Pentecost 269, 277, 278 n160
Homer 273 n146
Horace: *Epistles* 101 n34; *Odes* 58 n2, 63 n16; *Satires* 7 n16, 61 n12

'horns of the cross' 219 n41, 267 n133
Hugh of St Cher (on Luke) xiii, and passim
humility 111 n19, 120 n14

idolatry 77 n19, 128 n41, 129–30, 130 n1
image of God, humans created in 74 n13, 165–6 n32
Isaac 264
Isidore of Seville 226 n66

Jerome xi; not translator of NT 89 n2
– *Adversus Helvidium* 158 n10
– *Commentarii in Isaiam* 153 n60, 259 n105
– *Commentarii in Ezekielem* 248 n69, 253 n85
– *Commentary on Jeremiah* 260 n106
– *Commentary on Micah* 153 n60
– *Commentarii in evangelium Matthaei* (1) 253 n83, (21) 145 n37, 147 n43, 147 n45, 149 n50, 151 n56, 152 n57; (22) 164 n29, 165 n31, 166 n33; (23) 25 n65; (24) 116 n29, 179 n20;(26) 198 n41, 200 n48, 204 n61; (27) 211 n15, 217 n38;(28) 229 n10
– *De nominibus Hebraicis* 99 n25, 131 n4, 145 n37, 152 n57, 166 n33, 183 n2, 184 n3, 241 n44, 243 n49, 246 n60, 264 n119
– *Epistles* (7) 211 n16; (21) 75 n14, 77 n19, 78 nn22–3, 79 n24, 80 n29, 82 n34; (22) 79 n24, 81 n32, 89 n2; (69) 158 n10; (121) 88 n2, 92 n10, 95 n15
Jerusalem: fall of 46 n2, 48 n6, 153 n63, 176 n12; spiritual 243–4
Jesus: accessible in Scripture 134 n13, 277 n158; baptism in blood 43 n44; deeds of 44 n48; the good shepherd 72 nn8–9; as high priest 218 n40; human nature of 43 n44, 105 n1, 199 n47; knows unspoken thoughts 59 nn3–4, 127 n36, 137 n18; models pacifism 217–19; models perseverance with sinners 190 n23; models retreat for prayer 2 n2, 183 n29; prepares disciples and clergy for preaching and teaching 3 n5, 28 n6, 34 n21, 37 n31, 40 n36, 91–2 n8, 121 n17, 143 n33, 219; teaching technique of 14 n38, 32 n16, 125 n31, 193, 195, 198 n40;
– OT prophecy points to 44 n48, 65 n21, 235–50: 235–7 (the true Moses), 237–8 (the prophesied Messiah), 240–1 (compared to priesthood of law), 245–6 (a new priest), 246–8 (new sacrifice), 248 (new kingdom and new king), 248–9 (lowliness and mildness of)
– earthly life fulfils prophecies 250–70: 250–1 (signs of spiritual kingship in), 251 (lineage of), 252–3 (virgin birth), 254–5 (visit of magi), 255 (slaughter of holy innocents), 255 (the Baptist his forerunner), 255–6 (begins mission in Galilee), 256 (manner of teaching), 256 (miracles), 257 (resentment of Jewish leadership), 257 (human weakness a stumbling block to the weak), 258–9 (betrayal by Judas), 259 (condemned by Jews and Romans), 260–3 (Jews condemn themselves), 260–2 (forbearance in face of death), 260–2 (shameful death), 262–3 (bridegroom of church and son of murdering synagogue), 264–7 (crucifixion), 268 (burial), 268–9 (resurrection), 269–70 (post-resurrection appearances and second coming)
'Jew': = 'confessor' 184 n3, 264 n119; = Pharisee 84–5 n37

Jews: Erasmus' attitude towards 84–5 n37, 223 n56; Christ's humanity a stumbling block to 105 n1; Jews and gentiles compared 41, 55 n26, 64 n20, 72 n7, 75 n14, 77 n19, 87–8 n43, 130–1 n3, 133–5, 135 n15, 136–8, 143–5, 149–50, 162 n24, 223 n56, 245; resentful of gentiles 86–7; salvation of 143 n33, 235; Samaritans and Galileans superior to Judeans 110 n13. *See also* Pharisees; scribes
John Chrysostom xi, xii; *Homiliae in Matthaeum* 13 n36, 15 n39, 19 n51, 29–30 n10, 53 n22, 65 n21, 122 n22, 123 n24, 125 n30, 125 n31, 127 n36, 145 n38, 167 n35, 174 n7, 176 n12, 179 n20, 194 n32, 195 n34, 200 nn47 and 48, 201 n53, 208 nn5 and 6, 253 n83 *Homiliae in Ioannem* 273 n147. *See also* Pseudo-Chrysostom
Joseph son of Jacob 252, 261
Joseph husband of Mary 253
Josephus: *Jewish Antiquities* 46 n2, 90 n5; *Jewish War* 153 n63, 176 n12
Judah, tribe of 254
Judas Iscariot 104–5, 105 n1, 190 nn22–3, 258–9
Judas of Galilee 46 n2
Justin Martyr: *Apologia 1* 265 n123, 267 n131, 268 n134; *Dialogus* 259 n105, 260 n106, 265 n123, 267 n131 and n133
Juvenal 31 n14, 61 n12, 77 n19, 95 n15

kingdom: described 112, 143–4, 249–50; of God is preaching 51 n16

Law: compared to gospel law 237–9, 239–40; end of prophesied 238–9; figures of 96–7; letter and spirit 51 n13, 85, 96–8, 133, 149; of Moses a guide to Jews 77 n19; priesthood of compared to that of Christ 240–1
literal interpretation 65 n24, 149 n50
Livy 147 n45, 191 n24, 197 n40
'Lord' 91 n7, 160 n19, 270 n139. *See also* Roman civic and military life; Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited: *dominus*
Lord's Prayer: especially for disciples 3 n5; Luke's version different from Matthew's 4 n7
Lucian 10 n26, 77 n19
Lucifer 3. *See also* Satan
Lucretius 168 n37
lust 77 n21
Lutheranizing 244 n53
LXX. *See* Septuagint

magi 255 n90
Mars, Roman god 68 n34
martyrs, martyrdom 151, 199 n43
Mary Magdalene 229 n11
Mary, mother of Jesus 252–3 and n83
mercy, towards sinner 70 n4, 87–8. *See also* neighbour
metaphor 13 n36 (military), 69 n36 (salt), 69 n39 (salt), 107 n6 (doctor and patient), 117 n5 (boxing), 152 n57 (Bethphage), 231 n18 (adage), 272 n142 (house and bread). *See also* allegory; analogy
monarchs 155–6
Moses 237 n33; blesses tribe of Joseph 267; a figure of Christ 235–7; foretells Christ 236–7, 264–5
mustard seed 52 n17, 108 n10

narrator of *Paraphrase* xi and n3, 69 n39, 160 n19, 263 n114. *See also* Erasmus, works, *Paraphrase on Luke*:

interpretation by narrator; uncertain assignment of speaker in
Nazarene, Nazareth 252
neighbour: Christian treatment of 8 n22, 88 n1, 137; mercy to 88, 99 n28
Nicholas of Lyra: (on Mark 7:11) 172 n2; (on Luke) xiii, and passim
Nicodemus 72 n7

Olivet, Mt, spiritual 151–2
Origen xii; *Contra Celsum* 77 n19, 168 n37; *Homiliae in Lucam* 149 n50, 165 n32
Ovid: *Heroides* 183 n1; *Metamorphoses* 63 n16, 263 n113, 271 n141

paraphrase, nature of x–xi, xi n2
Paris faculty of theology xiii, 61 n10, 119 n8, 134 n12, 195 n36, 215–16 n34, 221 n50, 232 n23, 240 n40, 274 n151. *See also* critics of Erasmus, Catholic; Béda, Noël
persistence in doing kindnesses 270 n139, 271 n140. *See also* neighbour; prayer
Persius 95 n15
Peter, apostle 194 n32, 204 n63, 265
'Pharisees' 84 n37, 166 n33
Pharisees 41, 70 n4, 73 n10, 84 n37, 86, 104, 105 n1, 133, 134, 151, 250, 259, 260, 265–6. *See also* Jews
philosophers 77 n19, 149, 250
Pilate 259–60, 263–4
Plato: *Apology* 28 n5; *Crito* 28 n5; *Euthyphro* 130 n1; *Phaedo* 168 n37; *Republic* 27 n1
Plautus 108 n9; *Aulularia* 9–10 n26, 38 n33; *Bacchides* and *Trinummus* 103 n42; *Pseudolus* 87 n43; *Stichus* 231 n19
Pliny *Naturalis historia* 77 n19, 130 n1, 133 n10
Plutarch 191 n24
prayer 2–10; and end-time 116 n2; manner of fulfilment 8 n20, 118 n6; obstacles to 128 n40; urgency in 7 n15, 128–9
pride 60 n8, 62
profligacy 77 n21
prophecy, in OT foretells Christ 133, 236–49 and nn31 and 70, 250–70
Prudentius *Psychomachia* 31 n14
Pseudo-Chrysostom *Homilia de filio prodigo* 75 nn14–15, 80 n27, 81 n31, 82 nn33–4, 85 n39
pun 97 n20, 199 n45

reason 44 n48; a guide to gentiles 77 n19; and logic, use of 237, 269. *See also* soul; syllogism
repentance 17 n46, 46 n2, 48 n6, 70 n4, 79 n25, 80 n27, 82 n33, 106 n5, 201 n53, 205 n64. *See also* Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited: *poenitentiam agere, resipiscere, resipuerit*
rhetoric, features of 12–13 n35, 40 n37, 44 n48, 51 n13, 67 n30, 80 n27, 81 n31, 82 nn33–4, 125 n31, 207 n2, 209 n8. *See also* declamation
righteousness 37 n32; physical and spiritual compared 236, 240–1. *See also* Law: letter and spirit
Roman civic and military life, allusions to 61 nn11–12, 77 n20, 93 n12, 97 n19, 157 n7, 191 n24, 197 n40, 207 n67, 207 n1, 209 n9, 211 n15, 234 n26. *See also* 'Lord'; triumph

Sadducees 133, 166 n33
Sallust 27 n1, 88 n1
Samaria 255 n90
Satan 6 n14, 13 n36, 75 n14, 78 n23, 141 n28, 143, 148 n48, 152 n59,

158 n8, 231–2, 257, 267. *See also* Lucifer
scribes 84 n37, 171, 259. *See also* Jews
Scriptores Historiae Augustae 104 n42
Seneca *Epistulae morales* 163 n25
Septuagint (LXX) 243 n51, 246 n62, 248 n69, 259 n105, 260 n106, 261 n107, 264 n117, 268 n134
simplicity 120 n14, 121 n20, 123 n24, 171
Solomon 243 and n52
soul 35 n24, 168 n37; of animals 168 n37; rational part of 168 n37
stage, language of the 170 n42, 185 and n7. *See also* drama; Plautus; Terence
Strabo 77 n19, 135 n15
Suetonius 155 n66
'sword of the Spirit' or 'word' 195 n35, 197 n39, 249
syllogism 12 n35
'Syrian' 183 n2

temple: fall of 244–5; old and new compared 241–3; spiritual 173 n5, 174 n6
Terence 58 n2, 83 n34, 108 n9; *Adelphi* 83 n34, 87 n43, 231 n19; *Hecyra* 211 n17
Tertullian: *Adversus Iudaeos* 267 n131; *Adversus Marcionem* 131 n3, 197 n39, 236 n31, 243 n52, 249 n72, 250 nn73–4, 252 n83, 255 n90, 260 n106, 261 n107, 264 n120, 267 nn131 and 133, 268 n134
theologians 60 n10, 156. *See also* Paris faculty of theology
Theophilus 163 n26, 170, 187, 218, 223, 223 n56, 263 n114, 267 n133
Theophylact: *Enarratio in Matthaeum* 120 n15, 256 n94; *Ennaratio in Lucam* xi, xii, and passim
Thomas, apostle 274 n151
Thomas Aquinas: *Catena aurea* xii, xii n5, and passim; *Quaestiones de anima* 168 n37; *Summa theologiae* 77 n21, 168 n37, 180 n25
triumph 147 and n45, 149, 217 and n36, 218–19, 227 and n6, 263 n115, 267 n132
tropological interpretation 145 n37, 146 n39, 149 n50, 151–2, 154 n63, 155–6, 225–6, 226 n66 and n1,
trust. *See* faith/trust
typological interpretation of Old Testament 188–9, 188 n15, 189 n18, 235–70, 235 n31

Udall, Nicholas 158 n10
underworld (pagan) 100 n29

Valla, Lorenzo *Annotationes in Lucam* 10 n28, 11 n30, 26 n67, 33 n19, 35 nn25–6, 55 n26, 83 n36, 89 n2, 102 n37, 119 nn9–10, 121 nn17 and 20, 132 n9, 183 n30
Varro *De re rustica* 89 n2
Venantius Fortunatus 267 n131
Virgil: *Aeneid* 47–8 n5, 63 n16, 100 n29, 155 n67, 178 n17, 183 n1, 273 n146; *Georgics* 8 n19
voice. *See* narrator of Paraphrase
Vulgate: language of praised 65 n23, 123 n26; *Paraphrase* accommodates x–xi, 6 nn12 and 14, 7 nn16 and 18, 9 n25, 15 n41, 16 n44, 18 n48, 37 nn30 and 32, 48 n8, 55 n26, 58 n34, 62 n14, 63 n19, 73 n12, 76 n16, 79 n26, 83 n35, 90 n5, 99 nn26–7, 102 n37, 108 n9, 109 n12, 111 nn18 and 20, 115 n28, 122 n23, 123 n26, 139 n23, 147 n44, 154 n65, 155 n67, 156 n2, 178 n18, 186 n9, 203 n60, 214 n25, 274 n149; *Paraphrase*

alters x–xi, 26 n67, 37 n30, 48 n8, 55 n26, 63 n17, 73 n12, 76 n16, 78 n22, 79 n26, 86 n40, 89 n3, 90 nn5–6, 96 n17, 100 n29, 101 n33, 102 n37, 111 n20, 119 nn9–11, 120 n13, 121 n20, 132 n9, 139 n23, 142 n30, 147 n44, 172 n1, 173 n3, 179 n20, 181 n26, 182 nn27–8, 183 n30, 189 n21, 191 n25, 203 n60, 210 n14, 214 n25, 227 n5, 230 n13, 243 n5, 276 n156

wealth, nature and use of 32 n15, 34 n20, 38 n33, 74–5 n14, 89 n4, 92–6, 94 n13 95 n14, 138 n22. *See also* desire

William of Auvergne 168 n37

women, role in fall and redemption 229 n10

wine, old and new 95 n14, 155 n68

word. *See* Index of Greek and Latin Words Cited, *sermo, verbum*

Xenophon *Oeconomus* 89 n2

Zacchaeus 130 n3. *See also* allegory

Zion, Mt, spiritual 151–2, 244

This page intentionally left blank

This book

was designed by

VAL COOKE

based on the series design by

ALLAN FLEMING

and was printed by

University

of Toronto

Press